

**‘A Person Does Not Always Look Like Himself’: The
Visual Representation of Russian Writers 1860-1899**

Emma Helena Minns

School of Slavonic and East European Studies
University College London

Ph.D. History

UMI Number: U592155

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U592155

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

The period 1860-1899 witnessed rapid developments in print technology and exhibition culture that diversified the types of images available and increased their accessibility to a wider audience. In Russia, this period also saw the increased significance of the position of the writer in society and an unprecedented number and variety of visual representations of writers were placed in the public arena. This thesis examines the ways in which Russian writers' reputations and status were reflected and shaped by visual representations; how writers' personal, professional and national identities were manifested in images and how these images were then received and interpreted by a Russian audience.

This thesis is divided into two parts. The first part examines the representation of writers primarily by those artists belonging to the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions (*Peredvizhniki*) and the creation of a portrait collection of Russian writers by the main patron of the *Peredvizhniki*, P.M. Tret'iakov. This thesis then analyses the ways in which these portraits were viewed and received. The reception given to images of writers, particularly in newspaper and journal reviews, is a central element of the thesis. Also discussed is the reproduction of portraits – painted, photographed and engraved – in illustrated publications.

Part two focuses solely on one writer, A.S. Pushkin. In the last two decades of the nineteenth century the position of Pushkin as Russia's national poet was established and two major celebrations of the writer occurred in 1880 and 1899. This section looks at the visual heritage of Pushkin and how this developed to form a definitive Pushkin iconography by 1899. The reception of Pushkin's visual representation in 1880 and 1899 is examined through the analysis of Pushkin exhibitions and the use of Pushkin's image in advertisements and packaging designs.

Table of Contents

Volume I

Title Page	1
Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
Abbreviations	4
List of Illustrations	5
Acknowledgements	14
Preface	15
Introduction: Early Representations of Intellect	36
Part one: The <i>Peredvizhniki</i> and the Portrait of the Writer	
i. Collaboration and Creation, the Writer takes Shape	62
ii. A Case Study on the Comparisons and Conflicts in the Visual Representations of Dostoevskii and Tolstoi	94
iii. Hanging on Walls and Printed on Pages, the Writer takes up Space. Newspaper Reviews and Exhibition Guides	102
iv. Beyond the Galleries: the Reproduction and Possession of Images	143
Part two: The Visual Use and Abuse of A.S. Pushkin	
i. The Visual Heritage of Pushkin	185
ii. Pushkin in Late Imperial Russia, Celebration and Commercialization	213
Conclusion	255
Appendix	258
Bibliography	262
Volume II	
Illustrations	

Abbreviations

ARPM	All-Russian Pushkin Museum, St. Petersburg.
o/c	oil on canvas
PexINK	Posthumous exhibition of the works of I.N. Kramskoi, St. Petersburg, 1887.
PexVGP	Posthumous exhibition of the works of V.G. Perov, Moscow and St. Petersburg, 1882-1883.
RM	The State Russian Museum, St. Petersburg.
Srgp	D.A. Rovinskii, <i>Slovar' russkikh gravirovannykh portretov</i> , 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1889.
TG	The State Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow.
Tpkhv	V.V. Andreeva et al. (comps.), <i>Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok, 1869-1899, pis'ma, dokumenty</i> , 2 vols. Moscow, 1987.
1 st TAE	First exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions (<i>Peredvizhniki</i>).
2 nd TAE	Second exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions. Note: The 2 nd exhibition did not visit Moscow. Instead some of its paintings, including some portraits, were included in the 3 rd .
3 rd TAE	Third exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
4 th TAE	Fourth exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
5 th TAE	Fifth exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
6 th TAE	Sixth exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
7 th TAE	Seventh exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
9 th TAE	Ninth exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
12 th TAE	Twelfth exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
15 th TAE	Fifteenth exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
16 th TAE	Sixteenth exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.
23 rd TAE	Twenty-third exhibition of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions.

List of Illustrations

1. I.N. Nikitin, *Portrait of a Hetman/Self Portrait*, circa 1731, RM.
2. D.G. Levitskii, *Portrait of P.A. Demidov*, 1773, TG.
3. V.L. Borovikovskii, *Portrait of G.R. Derzhavin*, 1795, TG.
4. D.G. Levitskii, *Portrait of N.I. Novikov*, 1796-97 (?), TG.
5. O.A. Kiprenskii, *Portrait of V.A. Zhukovskii*, 1816, TG.
6. *Portrait of M.Iu. Lermontov*. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 8 October 1889.
7. *Portrait of M.Iu. Lermontov*. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 14 July 1891.
8. *S.T. Aksakov*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
9. S.L. Levitskii, Group photograph of contributors to the journal *Sovremennik*, 1856.
10. S.L. Levitskii, *A.I. Herzen*, 1865.
11. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of A.I. Herzen*, 1867, TG.
12. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.F. Pisemskii*, 1869, Ivanov Museum of Art.
13. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.N. Ostrovskii*, 1871, TG.
14. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii*, 1872, TG.
15. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.N. Maikov*, 1872, TG.
16. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of I.S. Turgenev*, 1872, RM.
17. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of M.P. Pogodin*, 1872, TG.
18. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of V.I. Dal'*, 1872, TG.
19. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of I.S. Kamynin*, 1872, TG.
20. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1873, TG.
21. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1873, Iasnaia Poliana Museum-Reserve.
22. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of I.A. Goncharov*, 1874, TG.

23. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of D.G. Grigorovich*, 1876, TG.
24. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov*, 1877, TG.
25. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs*, 1877-78, TG.
26. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1879, TG.
27. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of I.S. Turgenev*, 1871, State Art Gallery of Armenia, Erevan.
28. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov*, 1872, RM.
29. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1872, RM.
30. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1884, TG.
31. I.E. Repin, *Portrait of A.F. Pisemskii*, 1880, TG.
32. I.N. Kramskoi, *The Poet A.N. Maikov Fishing*, 1883, State Literary Museum, Moscow.
33. N.A. Iaroshenko, *Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1886, Unknown location.
34. W. Carrick, *N.A. Nekrasov*, 1878. Reproduced in *Na pamiat' Nikolae Alekseeviche Nekrasove*, St. Petersburg, 1878.
35. N.D. Dmitriev-Orenburgskii, *Portrait of I.S. Turgenev*, 1879. Engraved by I.P. Pozhalostin. Reproduced in *Zapiski okhotnika*, St. Petersburg, 1888.
36. F.M. Dostoevskii. From original photograph by K.A. Shapiro, 1879. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 7 February 1881.
37. K.A. Trutovskii, *Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii*, circa 1847. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 13 January 1896.
38. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii on his Deathbed*, 1881. Reproduced in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii F.M. Dostoevskogo v shesti tomakh*, St. Petersburg, 1886.
39. M.M. Panov, *F.M. Dostoevskii*, 1880.
40. V.G. Perov, *F.M. Dostoevskii*, 1872. Engraved by I.S. Panov. Reproduced in *Vospitanie i obuchenie*, 1881.
41. I.E. Repin, *L.N. Tolstoi in Armchair*, 1887, TG.

42. I.E. Repin, *The Ploughman* (L.N. Tolstoi), 1887, TG.
43. Caricature based on *The Ploughman*. Reproduced in *Iskra*, 1903.
44. I.E. Repin, *L.N. Tolstoi in the Study at Iasnaia Poliana*, 1891, Institute of Russian Literature (*Pushkinskii dom*).
45. I.E. Repin, *L.N. Tolstoi Resting in the Forest under a Tree*, 1891, TG.
46. V.G. Perov, *The Bird Catchers*, 1870, TG, and *Hunters at Rest*, 1871, TG. Reproduced in *Illiustrirovannyi katalog posmertnoi vystavki proizvedenii V.G. Perova (1833-1882)*, St. Petersburg, 1883.
47. The V.G. Perov Hall of the Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow, circa 1898.
48. Exhibition at the Association for the Encouragement of Art. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 2 June 1879.
49. The 16th *Peredvizhniki* Exhibition. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 10 May 1886.
50. V.G. Perov, *Portraits of Dostoevskii, Turgenev, Pogodin and Dal'*. Reproduced in *Illiustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki v Moskve*, 1882 g., St. Petersburg, 1882.
51. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1873. Reproduced in *Illiustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki v Moskve*, 1882 g., St. Petersburg, 1882.
52. K.A. Shapiro, *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1870. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 29 August 1881.
53. M.M. Panov, *I.S. Turgenev*, 1867.
54. S.L. Levitskii, *I.S. Turgenev*, 1879. Reproduced in *Sochineniia I.S. Turgenev*, Moscow, 1880.
55. *N.A. Nekrasov*. From original photograph by A.I. Denier, 1868. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Stikhotvoreniia N.A. Nekrasova. Postmertnoe izdanie. Tom I 1845-1860*, St. Petersburg, 1879.
56. *I.S. Turgenev*. From original photograph by M.M. Panov, 1880. Engraved by I.I. Khelmitskii, 1883. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 3 September 1883.
57. *I.S. Turgenev*. From original photograph by M.M. Panov, 1880. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I.S. Turgeneva*, St. Petersburg, 1884.

58. *S.T. Aksakov. Carte de visite* produced by Vezenberg and Co., St. Petersburg, circa 1870s.
59. *N.A. Nekrasov. Carte de visite* produced by Vezenberg and Co., St. Petersburg, circa 1870s.
60. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of S.T. Aksakov*, 1878. TG.
61. *S.T. Aksakov*. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 38, 1891.
62. *A.N. Maikov*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
63. *N.A. Nekrasov*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, 1869.
64. *A.N. Ostrovskii*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
65. *A.F. Pisemskii*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
66. *N.A. Nekrasov*. Engraved by L.A. Seriakov. Reproduced in *Russkie deiateli v portretakh, gravirovannykh akademikom Lavrentiem Seriakovym*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1882.
67. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*. Engraved by V.V. Mate. Reproduced in *Russkie deiateli v portretakh*, vol. III, St. Petersburg, 1889.
68. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.N. Ostrovskii*. Engraved by V.V. Mate. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 22 March 1880.
69. *L.N. Tolstoi*. Engraved by F.A. Merkin, 1888. Reproduced in *Russkie deiateli v portretakh*, vol. IV, St. Petersburg, 1890.
70. Sherer and Nabgoltz, *L.N. Tolstoi*, 1868.
71. *I.S. Turgenev*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1876.
72. S.L. Levitskii, *N.A. Nekrasov*, circa 1871.
73. *N.A. Nekrasov*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1877.
74. *F.M. Dostoevskii*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1877.
75. *A.N. Ostrovskii*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1876.

76. *L.N. Tolstoi*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Nashi deiateli*, vol. VI, St. Petersburg, 1879.
77. Front cover of K.A. Shapiro, *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, St. Petersburg, 1880.
78. K.A. Shapiro, *I.A. Goncharov*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
79. K.A. Shapiro, *F.M. Dostoevskii*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
80. S.L. Levitskii, *N.A. Nekrasov*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
81. K.A. Shapiro, *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
82. K.A. Shapiro, *I.S. Turgenev*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
83. K.A. Shapiro, *A.N. Ostrovskii*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1880.
84. K.A. Shapiro, *A.F. Pisemskii*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1880.
85. K.A. Shapiro, *L.N. Tolstoi*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1880.
86. I.N. Kramskoi, Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov. Lithographed by I.N. Kramskoi. Reproduced in *Svet*, March 1878.
87. V.A. Tropinin, Portrait of A.S. Pushkin, 1827. Reproduced in *Obshchepoleznyi kalendar' na 1890*, Moscow, 1889.
88. M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin. Reproduced in *Obshchepoleznyi kalendar' na 1890*, Moscow, 1889.
89. Chocolate box lid with portraits of Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol. Produced by I.L. Dingz, Moscow, circa 1899, ARPM.
90. N.N. Ge, *Pushkin and Pushchin at Mikhailovskoe*, 1875. Reproduced in *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
91. Bar of Soap with impression of portrait of A.S. Pushkin, 1899, ARPM.
92. Promotional placard for the 'Pushkin Pen', 1899, ARPM.

93. O.A. Kiprenskii, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827, TG.
94. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827, ARPM.
95. Newspaper advertisement for S. Librovič, *Pushkin v portretakh*, 1899, ARPM.
91. 96. G.J. Geitman, *Aleksandr Pushkin*, 1822. Reproduced in *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
97. N.I. Utkin, *A.S. Pushkin*, 1828. (After Kiprenskii).
98. T. Wright, *A.S. Pushkin*, 1837. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 23 May 1899.
99. Chocolate box lid featuring G.J. Geitman's *Aleksandr Pushkin*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
100. J. Vivien de Chateaubriand, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1826. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 12 November 1883.
101. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Torzhestvo otkrytiia pamiatnika A.S. Pushkinu*, Moscow, 1880.
102. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Torzhestvo otkrytiia pamiatnika A.S. Pushkinu*, Moscow, 1880.
103. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Engraved by L.A. Seriakov. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 29 January 1887.
104. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
105. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Al'bom Pushkinskoi iubileinoi vystavki v Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk v S. Peterburge. Mai 1899*, Moscow, 1899.
106. Chocolate box lid featuring V.A. Tropinin, *A.S. Pushkin*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
107. Individual chocolate wrapper featuring V.A. Tropinin, *A.S. Pushkin*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
108. Calendar published by the lithographic workshop of M.T. Solov'ev, Moscow, featuring V.A. Tropinin, *A.S. Pushkin* and assorted characters from Russian fairy tales, circa 1899, ARPM.
109. Box of perfume 'Bouquet A.S. Pouchkine'. Produced by Ed. Pinaud, 1899, ARPM.

110. Commemorative Pushkin rosettes, 1899, ARPM.
111. *A.S. Pushkin*. Originally published in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 1837.
Reproduced in S. Librovich, *Pushkin v portretakh*, St. Petersburg, 1890.
112. *A.S. Pushkin*. Reproduced in *Poet Pushkin*, St. Petersburg, 1880.
113. 10 portraits of A.S. Pushkin produced in 1837. Reproduced in *Al'bom Pushkinskoi vystavki, ustroennoi Obshchestvom liubitelei rossiiskoi slovestnosti v zalakh Istoricheskogo muzeia v Moskve 29 maia-13 iunia 1899 g.*, Moscow, 1899.
114. G.J. Geitman, *Aleksandr Pushkin*, 1822. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 29 November 1875.
115. L.E. Dmitriev-Kavkazskii, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1880. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 24 January 1887.
116. Illustration to 'Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe'. Reproduced in *Pushkinskii sbornik*, Moscow, 1899.
117. I.K. Aivazovskii and I.E. Repin, *To the Sea*, 1887, ARPM.
118. 'Pushkin Caramels' featuring I.K. Aivazovskii and I.E. Repin, *To the Sea*.
Produced by N. Syromiatnikov, 1899, ARPM.
119. A.M. Opekushin, *Monument to A.S. Pushkin*, 1880. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 24 May 1880.
120. Various designs for the Pushkin Monument. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 24 May 1880.
121. Opening of the Pushkin Monument. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 1 July 1880.
122. The 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 21 June 1880.
123. K. Briullov, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*. Reproduced in the *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
124. The Pushkin Jubilee Exhibition in the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, 1899. Reproduced in *Niva* no. 25, 1899.
125. Front cover to Pushkin Jubilee supplement of *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, May 1899, ARPM.
126. Vodka bottle shaped to resemble A.S. Pushkin, circa 1880s, ARPM.
127. Penknife featuring portrait of A.S. Pushkin, 1899, ARPM.

128. Metal clock face featuring portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by V. Bonaker, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
129. Pushkin Handkerchief. Produced by Brokar and Co., Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
130. Newspaper advertisement for the 'Pushkin clock', produced by M.M. Khazanov, Warsaw, 1899, ARPM.
131. Chocolate box lid with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by I.L. Dingz, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
132. Chocolate box lid with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by M. Konradi, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
133. Individual confectionery wrappers produced by a variety of firms, circa 1899, ARPM.
134. Packet of *papirosy* featuring a portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by A.N. Shaposhnikov, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
135. Promotional placard for '*Papirosy* A.S. Pushkin'. Produced by the Bros. Aslanidi, Rostov-on-Don, 1899, ARPM.
136. Promotional placard for 'Pushkinskie' *papirosy*. Produced by N.K. Popov, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
137. Packet of 'Pushkinskie' *papirosy*. Produced by N.K. Popov, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
138. Packet of *papirosy* 'Pushkin'. Produced by the Bros. Shapshal, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
139. Lid of 'Caramels Pushkin'. Produced by Bligken and Robinson, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
140. Label from bottle of 'Jubilee Liqueur'. Produced by N.L. Shustov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
141. Wrapper from 'Soap A.S. Pushkin'. Produced by A.M. Ostroumov, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
142. Chocolate box lid with portrait of A.S. Pushkin and illustration to the *Tale of the Golden Fish*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
143. 'Caramels Pushkin', with a portrait of A.S. Pushkin and characters from his works. Produced by S. Vasil'ev, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.

144. 'Caramels Pushkin', with a portrait of A.S. Pushkin, the Pushkin monument and various characters from his works. Produced by V. Shuvalov and Sons, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
145. Portrait of A.S. Pushkin on commemorative porcelain beaker. Produced by M.S. Kuznetsov, 1899, ARPM.
146. Dedication to A.S. Pushkin on commemorative porcelain beaker. Produced by M.S. Kuznetsov, 1899, ARPM.
147. Illustration to *Ruslan and Liudmilla* on commemorative porcelain beaker. Produced by M.S. Kuznetsov, 1899, ARPM.
148. Tin tray with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by V. Bonaker, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
149. Wall calendar mount with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by I.D. Sytin, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
150. Packet of 'A.S. Pushkin *papirosy*'. Produced by N.A. Pilipenko, Kiev, 1899, ARPM.
151. Detail of Chocolate box lid with V.A Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Produced by the Krupskaja factory, St. Petersburg, 2003.

Acknowledgements

A doctoral thesis may be the work of one author, but it would be impossible to achieve without the assistance of many people and institutions over a number of years. First of all I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Lindsey Hughes without whose help, encouragement, moral and scholarly support I would never have undertaken this work. Without Professor Hughes' encouragement I would not have had the confidence to begin this thesis and without the financial support of the Arts Humanities Research Board (now Council) I would not have had the means. Alongside the AHRC I also wish to thank the Graduate School of University College London and the British Association for Slavic and East European Studies for their financial assistance of research trips to Russia and Finland. In Britain I would like to thank the following individuals for their assistance: the staff of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, UCL, in particular, Dr. Robin Aizlewood, Professor Roger Bartlett, Dr. Pamela Davidson, Dr. Sergei Bogatyrev and Professor Arnold McMillin. The staff of SSEES library all deserve thanks, but especially Mrs Vlasta Gyenes. From other British academic institutions I would like to thank Dr. Carol Adlam (University of Exeter) and Dr. Polly Blakesley (University of Cambridge). My fellow SSEES doctoral students also deserve mention; your encouragement was often needed – Dan, Derek, Chiara, Claire, Katya, Paul, Mark and Rachel – thank you. Many thanks to Stuart Whitehall who provided invaluable IT support.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Krikanov family in Moscow and to the Lomakin family in St. Petersburg for their hospitality and generosity. Research work in Russia can be fraught with difficulties and I would like to thank the following institutions and their staff, in Moscow: the State Public History Library; the Newspaper Department of the Russian State Library and the Library of the State Tret'iakov Gallery. In St. Petersburg: the National Library of Russia; the Library of the State Russian Museum; the Library of the Academy of Arts and the Dostoevskii Literary Memorial Museum. At the Russian Museum I am particularly grateful to Elena Stolbova for her time and advice. One institution that deserves particular heartfelt thanks is the All-Russian Pushkin Museum. The staff at the Pushkin-Apartment Museum provided me with their time and expert opinions, in addition to permitting me to photograph items from their rich collection of late nineteenth-century Pushkin material. In particular I must thank Larissa Soldatova, Tat'iana Georgievna and Galina Valentinova.

A short research trip to Helsinki proved most beneficial thanks to the efficiency of the staff at the Helsinki University Library, National Library of Finland, in particular Irina Lukka of the Slavonic Library.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, my husband Mark, and of course, my Patterdale terrier Herbie; investigating the past is impossible without support and comfort in the present.

A portraitist, for example, seats his subject to paint its portrait; he prepares; he studies the subject carefully. Why does he do that? Because he knows from experience that a person does not always look like himself, and therefore he seeks out 'the principal idea of his physiognomy,' that moment when the subject most resembles his self. The portraitist's gift consists in the ability to seek out and capture that moment. Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevskii.¹

Preface

In a footnote to her essay 'Painting and autobiography', Catriona Kelly highlights the scholarly vacuum around the visual representation of Russian writers and the 'part played by appearance' in dictating the way in which they were received. The topic, Kelly states, 'is in need of exhaustive treatment'.² Kelly is particularly concerned with the depiction of early twentieth-century Russian writers and the establishment of 'a canonical view of the modernist poet's physical appearance'.³ The focus of my own work on the visual representation of Russian writers lies within the second half of the nineteenth century; a period that witnessed dramatic developments in Russian painting and image reproduction. Kelly's point nevertheless, that images of Russian writers have been a neglected area of study, is just as relevant to the 1870s as it is to the 1920s. Only Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin (1799-1837) has attracted any significant research or study in this respect, and this in the main by Russian scholars.

The aim of this thesis is to examine the ways in which a variety of visual representations - including Realist painted portraits, engravings and advertisements - presented Russian writers to a nineteenth-century Russian audience and how this audience received them. This work does not provide a detailed inventory of every portrait of every Russian writer created in the period 1860 to 1899, but rather, through case studies, analyses the role played by image making and image reproduction in the creation and representation of certain Russian writers' identities. Primarily, those writers selected for discussion were

¹ F.M. Dostoevskii, 'Apropos of the Exhibition', *A Writer's Diary Volume One, 1873-76*, trans. and annotated K. Lantz, Evanston, Illinois, 1993, p. 214.

² C. Kelly, 'Painting and autobiography: Anna Prismanova's "pesok" and Anna Akhmatova's "Epicheskie motivy"', in C. Kelly & S. Lovell (eds.), *Russian Literature, Modernism and the Visual Arts*, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 58-87, p. 84.

³ C. Kelly & S. Lovell, 'Introduction: boundaries of the spectacular', *Ibid.*, p. 9.

living and working during the second half of the nineteenth century. Therefore, some major early nineteenth-century Russian writers, images of whom were created and reproduced between 1860-1899, but who were by then deceased, do not feature prominently such as Mikhail Iur'evich Lermontov (1814-1841), Ivan Andreevich Krylov (1769-1844) and Nikolai Vasil'evich Gogol (1809-52). The exception to this is A.S. Pushkin, who is the focus of the second part of the thesis. Moreover, this study only examines images in two-dimensional form, i.e. painted or printed onto a variety of surfaces; sculptures, busts and monuments are not included within the scope of this work. Once again, however, Pushkin provides the exception and A.M. Opekushin's 1880 monument to the poet is briefly discussed due to the wide scale reproduction of it on printed matter.⁴

This thesis ends its coverage in 1899 for a number of reasons. The final year of the nineteenth century witnessed a turning point in the decline of Realist painting in Russian art and the beginnings of the avant-garde movement. In 1898 the St. Petersburg based art group *World of Art* (*Mir Iskusstva*) had formed under the leadership of the critic and impresario Sergei Pavlovich Diaghilev (1872-1929) and published the first edition of its eponymous journal in November of that same year. January 1899 saw *Mir Iskusstva* stage its first exhibition in St. Petersburg and in the first years of the new century Diaghilev's influence as a promoter of Russian art and culture continued to grow.⁵ 1899 marked the dawn of a new appreciation of Russian art overseas, but it was the applied and decorative arts, rather than painting, that received critical acclaim. Items from Arts and Crafts workshops such as Abramtsevo triumphed at the 1900 Paris World Exhibition. The following year the architectural combination of art nouveau and neo-Russian style on display in pavilions designed by Fedor Osipovich Shekhtel' (1859-1926) delighted the crowds at the Glasgow World

⁴ It should also be noted that no portraits of female writers are discussed in the thesis. This is due to the fact that female writers were not as celebrated as male writers; few female writers' portraits were painted by *Peredvizhniki* artists or shown at the travelling exhibitions. One notable exception is N.N. Ge's 1892 portrait of Elena Osipovna Likhacheva (1836-1904). N.A. Iaroshenko often portrayed the female intellectual figure in his 1880s' portraits of girl students, but these were often anonymous subjects and not specifically writers.

⁵ A recent exhibition *Working for Diaghilev* held at the Groninger Museum, Groningen (11 December 2004-28 March 2005) demonstrated Diaghilev's influence on Russian culture in the first years of the twentieth century. See the exhibition catalogue, S. Scheijen (ed.), *Working For Diaghilev*, Schoten, 2004.

Exhibition.⁶ Portraits of writers continued to be executed, but there was no systematic pattern of commissioning them, as had previously been the case. Painting, including portrait painting, was moving in a new direction in which experiments in line and colour were just as (if not more) important as providing an accurate physical likeness and insight into the subject's psyche. The portraits of this era must await a separate investigation.⁷

This thesis is interdisciplinary in nature, encompassing art history, cultural and social history, and literature. However, it is not the work of Russian writers that is of primary importance to this study, but the public role and position of writers who had a unique place in nineteenth-century Russian society. As figures who could be as subject to vilification and punishment as they could to celebration and applause, writers, particularly of fiction – poetry, novels and plays – and the work they produced, have been identified as occupying a crucial position in late imperial Russian society and culture. One commentator, if not the first, to publicly voice this opinion was the writer and journalist Vissarion Belinskii (1811-1848) who in 1847 declared that the role of the writer in Russian society was one without equal; Russian society was dependent on its writers for social progress and development:

Literature alone, despite the Tatar censorship, still lives and moves forward. That is why we hold the title of writer in such esteem, why literary success is so easy among us, even for a writer of small talent. With us the title of poet and writer has long since eclipsed the tinsel of epaulettes and gaudy uniforms. [...] And here the public is right: it looks upon Russian writers as its only leaders, its defenders and saviours from the dark night of autocracy, orthodoxy, and nationality; and thus it is always ready to forgive a writer a poor book but will never forgive him a pernicious one.⁸

Given Belinskii's professional and personal involvement with literature, it is hardly surprising that he argued for its supreme importance as a means of the

⁶ See C. Cooke, 'Shekhtel in Kelvingrove and Mackintosh on the Petrovka: Two Russo-Scottish Exhibitions at the Turn of the Century', *Scottish Slavonic Review*, 10, spring 1988, pp. 177-205.

⁷ An excellent selection of portraits of Russian writers and other cultural figures from the first two decades of the twentieth century accompany biographies and memoirs in L.S. Aleshina & G.Iu. Sternin, *Obrazy i liudei Serebriannogo veka*, Moscow, 2002.

⁸ Belinskii made this statement in response to Nikolai Gogol's *Selected Passages from a Correspondence with Friends* (1846). In this work Gogol, who had previously been considered a critic, even an enemy of the Russian State and officialdom, 'humbly and piously accepted both the Orthodox Church and the established social order'. J.M. Edie, J.P. Scanlan & M.B. Zeldin (eds.), *Russian Philosophy*, 3 vols. vol. I, Chicago, 1965, p. 284. V. Belinskii, 'Letter to Gogol,' trans. J.P. Scanlan, *Russian Philosophy*, vol. I, pp. 318-319.

expression of Russian national spirit and an alternative to Nicholas I's programme of 'Official Nationality'.⁹ However Belinskii's statement on the significant position of writers is one that continues to be made, albeit in more objective terms, by scholars today. Geoffrey Hosking for example, views the role of the Russian writer in terms of nation building, the nation being the 'imagined community',¹⁰ of the nineteenth-century Russian reading public and the writer as its representative or spokesman:

Yet the very magnitude of the mission devolved upon literature put constant pressure on writers to move outside their profession and take on themselves roles to which they were by nature less well-suited: those of political commentator, public tribune, even religious prophet.¹¹

Jeffrey Brooks, in his study of the growth of literacy and 'popular' reading in late imperial Russia, briefly examines the presentation in illustrated weekly magazines of what he terms 'classical Russian writers'.¹² He reports an advertisement headline in the journal *Niva* (*The Meadow*): 'Are these not the brightest stars of our literary firmament? The glory and pride of Russia?'¹³ Like Hosking, Brooks also emphasises the roles writers either gave to themselves, or more usually were given, as representatives of an 'alternative' Russian national consciousness. He observes:

The glorification of the names of the great Russian writers of the nineteenth century and some from the twentieth also satisfied the need to develop a sense of national identity that did not depend on the tsar or the Orthodox Church.¹⁴

It is not the task of this work then, to argue for or justify the significance of writers in mid-late-nineteenth-century Russian society; this has already been successfully achieved by contemporary commentators and respected scholars. What this work aims to do is to evaluate the contribution made by visual

⁹ 'Official Nationality' was a conservative ideology officially proclaimed in 1833 and based on three principles: Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality (*narodnost*). See N. Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia 1825-55*, Berkeley, 1959.

¹⁰ Hosking applies Benedict Anderson's theory on the role of print technology and capitalism in creating an 'imagined community' of readers to nineteenth-century Russia. See G. Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire, 1552-1917*, London, 1997, pp. 288-289. Also B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, London, 1991.

¹¹ Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire*, pp. 293-294.

¹² J. Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature 1861-1917*, Princeton, 1985, p. 113.

¹³ From *Niva*, no. 49, 1912, *Ibid*.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 299.

representations of writers in the establishment of their respected reputation and powerful status.

Thesis Structure

This thesis is divided into two main parts which are subsequently sub-divided. Part one concentrates on the creation, display and reproduction of portraits produced in the 1870s and 1880s by, for the most part, those painters known as *Peredvizhniki*, members of the Society of Travelling Art Exhibitions (*Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok*).¹⁵ These portraits were executed in a Realist manner that did not particularly flatter the subject, but rather, as Linda Nochlin describes, ‘claimed that greatness was neither a matter of external accessories nor the traditional appurtenances of glory, but rather, that it lay in certain talents, qualities and abilities’.¹⁶ Firstly, section i considers the collaboration between patron, artist, and writer in the creation of portraits, how writers visually *took shape*. The majority of the painted portraits considered in part one were commissioned by the Moscow merchant and art patron Pavel Mikhailovich Tret’iakov (1832-1898) for inclusion in his art gallery (in addition to being shown at *Peredvizhniki* travelling exhibitions). Section ii is a short case study on the comparisons and conflicts between arguably the two greatest Russian novelists of the second half of the nineteenth century, Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevskii (1821-1881) and Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoi (1828-1910). Sections iii and iv then look at how writers’ portraits *took up space* – in galleries, exhibitions and on the printed page; the visual representation of writers is placed within the wider context of the development of visual culture in the second half of the nineteenth century. Particular attention is paid to the reception of portraits given in newspaper and journal reviews of exhibitions and galleries; we consider whether these portraits attracted criticism and how critics presented them to their readership. With the growth of exhibition culture, the establishment of illustrated journals and the increased availability and affordability of prints and photographs a greater number of people were given increased opportunities to see and consume images of writers. The relationship

¹⁵ Artists associated with this group are also sometimes referred to as ‘Wanderers’ or ‘Itinerants’ although throughout this thesis they will be referred to as *Peredvizhniki*.

¹⁶ L. Nochlin, *Realism*, Harmondsworth, 1971, p. 181.

between the unique painted *Peredvizhniki* portraits and mass-produced printed portraits is discussed with reference to how portraits in different mediums differ in the representation of their subjects.

The second part of the thesis is devoted to the visual representation of A.S. Pushkin in the second half of the nineteenth century, with particular reference to the Pushkin celebrations of 1880 and 1899. Part one examined how writers' images grew in number and variety from the 1870s onwards and in part two, we consider the production and propagation of Pushkin's image against the background of these developments in image making. The reproduction of Pushkin's image, in relation to the 1899 celebrations, is offered as the pinnacle in the development of the appropriation and dissemination of writers' images in nineteenth-century urban Russian society.

Although much has been written about painted portraits of Pushkin, particularly those executed in his lifetime, scant scholarly research has been carried out on later, mass-produced images of Russia's national poet. The visual heritage of Pushkin and his representation in the fine arts is discussed, but this section examines in greater depth the development of a Pushkin iconography that although originated in the 1820s, developed and established itself in popular consciousness through the continual reproduction of Pushkin on commercial items, from biscuit packets to souvenir badges. Through a detailed analysis of the visual representation of Pushkin, it is possible to examine the extent to which this writer had entered popular consciousness; how Pushkin's portrait came to represent more than a likeness of a writer, but was a symbol of Russian success that others aspired to be associated with.

Research Methodology

In undertaking this work, I found three studies on the issues that surround portraiture useful in the formation of my research methodology: Richard Brilliant's *Portraiture*, Ludmilla Jordanova's *Defining Features: Scientific and Medical Portraits 1660-2000* and Joanna Woodall (ed.) *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*.¹⁷ Woodall's and Brilliant's works address fundamental questions on the

nature, history and purpose of portraiture. Brilliant provides a simple definition of what a portrait is: ‘...portraits are art works, intentionally made of living or once living people by artists, in a variety of media, and for an audience.’¹⁸ All the visual representations this thesis makes reference to conform to this specification of what a portrait is, but some perhaps go beyond what are traditionally classified as portraits. Some, for example, are pictures that represent scenes from a writer’s life and which contain likenesses based on existing portraits; one example of this is the painting *Pushchin visiting Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* (*Pushchin u Pushkin v Mikhailovskom*) (1875) (Fig. 90) by the *Peredvizhniki* artist Nikolai Nikolaevich Ge (1831-1894).

But more significantly, Brilliant and Woodall discuss *how* a portrait represents the sitter, or, what aspects of the sitter they represent. The key concept used by Brilliant, Jordanova and Woodall and by this work is *identity*. One of the aims of this study is to examine how visual representations of writers contributed to their reputation and status in Russia and as Jordanova reiterates, ‘portraiture is an extremely important means through which identity is constructed. It constructs not just the identity of the artist and the sitter, but that of the institutions with which they are associated.’¹⁹

Brilliant talks only of *personal identity* and uses the term to include all the essential constituents of the individual:

a recognized or recognizable appearance; a given name that refers to no one else; a social, interactive function that can be defined; in context, a pertinent characterization; and a consciousness of the distinction between one’s own person and another’s, and of the possible relationship between them.²⁰

However, this work examines portraits of writers with reference to not one identity but three: *personal*, *professional* and *national*. According to Brilliant’s definition the professional and national characteristics of an individual would fall within the generic terminology of *personal identity*. However, the particular nature of the portraits studied here benefited from a deconstruction of ‘identity’

¹⁷ R. Brilliant, *Portraiture*, London, 1997; L. Jordanova, *Defining Features: Scientific and Medical Portraits 1660-2000*, London, 2000; J. Woodall (ed.), *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, Manchester, 1997.

¹⁸ Brilliant, *Portraiture*, p. 8.

¹⁹ Jordanova, *Defining Features*, pp. 18-19.

²⁰ Brilliant, *Portraiture*, p. 9.

into three separate, yet connected areas. These three categories are central to understanding the effect that visual representations of writers had on their subjects' status and reputation in nineteenth-century Russian society; how they presented their subjects as individuals, as writers and as Russians. The categories of *national* and *professional* identity are of particular importance as the majority of the images analysed in this work were created for a general audience and commissioned in order to show this audience successful *Russian writers*. Therefore this thesis will be concerned with how, if at all, the nationality and occupation of writers was expressed in portraits and whether this was done through obvious means, such as showing the subject in the activity of writing, or more subtle ones.

The two central concerns of this thesis are how a visual representation is created and how it is received. Brilliant stresses the importance of keeping in mind the audience, or viewer, when analysing a portrait:

Making portraits is a very purposeful activity; it is undertaken with the viewer in mind, whether that be the patron-sitter or someone else, even a stranger. Since the portrait, in effect, presents a person to the viewer, the portraitist always has to keep someone other than the subject in mind.²¹

The significance of the reception of images, not only of portraits, is supported by Peter Burke's work *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence*.²² This book on approaches to the study of images has been of primary importance to my own work. Burke presents a methodology that he describes as 'the cultural history of images' or 'the historical anthropology of images',²³ which focuses on 'the history of responses to images or the reception of works of art.'²⁴ This approach does not concentrate solely on the image; of equal importance are responses to the image and the cultural and social context in which the image exists: 'it is concerned to reconstruct the rules or conventions, conscious or unconscious, governing the perceptions and interpretation of images within a given culture.'²⁵

²¹ Brilliant, *Portraiture*, p. 40.

²² P. Burke, *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence*, London, 2001.

²³ Ibid., pp. 179-180.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 179.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 180.

This approach is a relatively recent one in the interpretation of images and one proponent of it has been David Freedberg with his work *The Power of Images*.²⁶ Burke singles this study out in particular, as it examines ‘actual rather than predicted responses to images by studying texts.’²⁷ The examination of texts is a key element to section iii which discusses the responses in newspaper and journal reviews to the portraits of writers shown at the *Peredvizhniki* travelling exhibitions.

When discussing the reception of portraits in this period it is also important to examine the consumption of them. Not only could individuals receive images of writers in galleries and exhibitions, they could also purchase images of them through illustrated journals, on mass produced prints and even on chocolate wrappers and cigarette cartons. The settings for the reception of portraits increased rapidly in the second half of the nineteenth century to include domestic and commercial environments. The portrait reproduced and disseminated through these means ‘reaches people beyond personal networks. As a commodity it can be bought by any one with the requisite funds and an interest in its contents.’²⁸

Studies of Russian Art and Portraiture

Pre-twentieth century Russian art,²⁹ in whatever form - painting, sculpture, drawing, architecture or design - is a subject on which there are comparatively few scholarly works in English. Those that do exist are usually either translations of Russian texts,³⁰ or narrative attempts to cover such a wide range of topics - from Byzantine icons to the Arts and Crafts movement - that there is little space for in depth analysis on a subject such as portraiture.³¹ When

²⁶ D. Freedberg, *The Power of Images*, Chicago, 1989.

²⁷ Burke, *Eyewitnessing*, p. 179.

²⁸ Jordanova, *Defining Features*, p. 29.

²⁹ On twentieth-century Russian art, particularly of the Avant-garde, a wide range of essays, books and exhibition catalogues exist in English. See J. Bowlt (ed.), *Russian Art of the Avant Garde*, London, 1991.

³⁰ For example, D.V. Sarabianov, *Russian Art from Neoclassicism to the Avant Garde*, New York, 1990 or A. Benois, *The Russian School of Painting*, London, 1916.

³¹ There exists no standard history of Russian art in English. Works that do offer a survey of the topic include: R. Auty & D. Obolenskii (eds.), *An Introduction to Russian Art and Architecture*, Cambridge, 1980; A. Bird, *A History of Russian Painting*, Oxford, 1987; G.H. Hamilton, *The Art and Architecture of Russia*, London, 1983; R. Hare, *The Art and Artists of Russia*, London, 1965; T. Talbot Rice, *A Concise History of Russian Art*, London, 1963.

portraiture is discussed, it is usually with reference to the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and artists such as Dmitrii Grigor'evich Levitskii (1735-1822), Vladimir Lukich Borovikovskii (1757-1825), and Orest Adamovich Kiprenskii (1782-1836). These three artists produced a number of portraits, particularly of females, that have become some of the most celebrated examples of Russian portraiture; in many cases not for who their subject is, but for how their subject is depicted.³² Yet even with such engaging works the coverage given to Russian portraiture by scholars can be brief. Tamara Talbot Rice's work attempts to cover in a single chapter Russian painting from the 1690s to the 1920s, even though icon painting is explored over the four previous chapters. Indeed, icon painting and church architecture seem to have dominated English language works on early Russian art to an almost overwhelming degree.³³ There are, however, relatively recent exceptions in which Russian portrait painting is addressed. James Cracraft's work, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery*,³⁴ has portraiture at its centre; it was this genre of painting that Peter I sponsored most vigorously during his reign. Lindsey Hughes also examines the development of Russian portrait painting in the early modern period.³⁵

But with reference to Russian portraiture produced in the second half of the nineteenth century, only Elizabeth Kridl Valkenier has provided any serious study in English, yet even this is within her larger analysis of the formation and work of the *Peredvizhniki*, or within the career of Il'ia Efimovich Repin (1844-1930). However, Valkenier does address the wider social, cultural and historical implications of the *Peredvizhniki*, and specifically makes reference to the artistic legacy of their portraits: 'In portrait painting, the *Peredvizhniki* have left an imprint so strong that to this day their likenesses of cultural figures are *the*

³² For example, Borovikovskii's portrait of M.I. Lopukhina (1797). This work has become one of the most famous Russian portraits, but not because of who Lopukhina was (a young Russian noblewoman) but of how Kiprenskii presented her.

³³ See for example: W.C. Brumfield, *Gold in Azure 1000 Years of Russian Architecture*, Boston, Mass., 1983; R. Cormack (ed.), *The Art of Holy Russia: Icons from Moscow 1400-1600*, London, 1998; R. Grierson (ed.), *Gates of Mystery: the Art of Holy Russia*, Cambridge, 1992; D. Talbot Rice, *Russian Icons*, London, 1947; T. Talbot Rice, *Russian Icons*, London, 1963; R. Temple, *Icons: a Search for Meaning*, London, 1982.

³⁴ J. Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery*, Chicago, 1997.

³⁵ L. Hughes, 'Images of the Elite: A Reconsideration of the Portrait in Seventeenth-Century Russia', *Von Moskau nach St. Petersburg: Das russische Reich im 17. Jahrhundert (Forschungen sur osteuropäischen Geschichte)*, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp. 167-185.

mental images that Russians have of Dostoevsky, Tolstoy or Nekrasov'.³⁶ Through a number of studies on the *Peredvizhniki* Valkenier has modified Soviet scholars' interpretation of the Society, which over emphasised its political and social ideas.

The only other scholar writing in English, whose work on nineteenth-century Russian art has informed my own research, is Rosalind Blakesley (Gray). Although not focusing on portraiture in detail, her monograph *Russian Genre Painting in the Nineteenth Century*³⁷ examines not only painting, but also the growth of artistic societies and journals in this period, providing source references and a bibliography that acted as vital points of departure for this work.

There are numerous studies by Russian scholars on eighteenth and early nineteenth century portraiture, including works on portrait miniatures and watercolours.³⁸ However, on portraiture produced in the period 1860-1899 considerably less research has been done. The most comprehensive survey on Russian portraiture was produced in the 1960s in a three-volume set, the one most relevant to my research being volume two: *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*.³⁹ It comprises eight essays on the major *Peredvizhniki* portraitists, as well as a general introduction that discusses the condition of portrait painting in the second half of the nineteenth century. This volume does contain useful observations on a number of portraits that my own work is concerned with, the chapter on Vasilii Grigor'evich Perov (1834-1882) devotes a number of pages to the artist's portraits of the dramatist Aleksandr Nikolaevich Ostrovskii (1823-1886) and F.M. Dostoevskii. However, the portraits are discussed within the context of Perov's body of work, rather than

³⁶ E.K. Valkenier, *Russian Realist Art, the State and Society: the Peredvizhniki and their Tradition*, New York, 1989, p. 79. See also her article 'The Peredvizhniki and the Spirit of the 1860s', *Russian Review*, no. 34, 1974, pp. 247-265; *Ilya Repin and the World of Russian Art*, New York, 1990; (ed.), *The Wanderers: Masters of 19th century Russian Painting*, Dallas, 1990.

³⁷ R.P. Gray, *Russian Genre Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford, 2000.

³⁸ For example, A.B. Sterligov, *Portret v russkoi zhivopisi XVII-pervoi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow 1986; S.M. Gorbacheva & S.V. Iamshchikov (comps.), *Russkii akvarel'nyi i karandashnyi portret pervoi poloviny XIX veka iz muzeev RSFSR*, Moscow, 1987; O.S. Evangulova, *Portretnaia zhivopis' v rossii vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1994; N.G. Saprykina, *Kollektsiia portretov sobraniia F.F. Vigel' 1786-1856* Moscow, 1980; T.A. Selinova (ed.), *Portretnaia miniatiura v Rossii XVIII-XIX vekov*, Leningrad, 1988.

³⁹ The three-volume set comprises: E.N. Galinka (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Pervoi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1966; N.N. Morgunova (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo*

compared and contrasted with other *Peredvizhniki* portraits of writers or other types of portraits of a particular writer.

In obtaining basic information concerning the size, medium and location of *Peredvizhniki* portraits, catalogues of Soviet exhibitions of *Peredvizhniki* works and individual *Peredvizhniki* artists have been invaluable. Of particular use has been the catalogue of the exhibition *Portretnaia zhivopis' Peredvizhnikov*, staged as part of the 1971-72 centenary celebrations of the formation of the *Peredvizhniki*.⁴⁰ For information on the creation and management of the *Peredvizhniki* and details on the exhibitions, the source this thesis has continually turned to is the two-volume *Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok, 1869-1899, pis'ma, dokumenty*.⁴¹ This Soviet-produced work contains reproductions of documents such as inventories, letters, receipts as well as supplying details of which pictures appeared, where exhibitions visited and attendance numbers; material that provided a foundation for my investigation into contemporary comments and reviews of the exhibitions. The *Peredvizhniki* have attracted a great deal of scholarly attention,⁴² however one must be cautious in the use of Soviet scholarship. As is evident, this thesis has made extensive use of such materials as they have made accessible primary source materials, however, Soviet analysis of the *Peredvizhniki* was usually presented in a tendentious ideological and political framework and ignored the commercial aspects of the Society, something the works by Valkenier do not. Understandably, Soviet art scholars presented the *Peredvizhniki* as an organization that embraced the ideological demands of the 'progressive' intellectual radicals of the 1860s, as artists 'who had been educated in the ideas of the great Russian teachers and revolutionary democrats Belinskii, Chernyshevskii and Dobroliubov, who strove to embody

portreta. Vtoroi poloviny XIX veka, Moscow, 1963 and N.N. Morgunova (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Kontsa XIX nachala XX veka*, Moscow, 1964.

⁴⁰ S.N. Gol'dshtein (ed.), *Portretnaia zhivopis' peredvizhnikov*, Moscow, 1972. The centenary celebrations included a reconstruction of the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition and individual exhibitions devoted to the portraiture, landscapes, genre paintings, drawings and watercolours of the *Peredvizhniki*.

⁴¹ V.V. Andreeva et al. (comps.), *Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok, 1869-1899, pis'ma, dokumenty*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1987.

⁴² There are numerous works on the *Peredvizhniki* by Russian scholars that examine both individual artists and the movement as a whole. One work that combines both is F.S. Roginskaia, *Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok: Istoricheskie ocherki*, Moscow, 1989.

these ideas in art'.⁴³ This representation of the *Peredvizhniki* frequently penetrated western works on Russian art, which repeated the notion that the *artists* staged their travelling exhibitions 'with the purpose of advocating social reforms to the country at large'.⁴⁴ The writings of figures such as Chernyshevskii did influence some members of the *Peredvizhniki*, but the society was primarily concerned with reforming the Russian art world and promoting the interests of artists, rather than the *narod*. Since the 1980s both Russian and Western scholars have attempted to counterbalance the earlier over-politicisation of the *Peredvizhniki* and have addressed the commercial element of the organization in their analyses of it.

Alongside catalogues and exhibition guides, the other area where the work of Soviet scholars has been vital to this thesis is the compilation and editing of volumes of letters and articles by artists, writers, patrons and critics. The process of publishing documents related to *Peredvizhniki* artists began in the last decades of the nineteenth century, with the deaths of the first generation of *Peredvizhniki* artists. In the year following the death of Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi (1837-1887) the critic Vladimir Vasil'evich Stasov (1824-1906) produced *Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi: ego zhizn', perepiska i khudozhestvenno-kriticheskie stat'i 1837-1887* which presented Kramskoi as a critic and commentator of art, as well as an artist. This volume provided the basis for subsequent published volumes of Kramskoi's correspondence; major editions appeared in 1937 and 1953.⁴⁵ Nearly all the major figures associated with the *Peredvizhniki* movement have had their correspondence and articles published by Soviet scholars and this thesis makes extensive use of them, particularly letters between P.M. Tret'iakov and *Peredvizhniki* from whom he commissioned portraits. With reference to Tret'iakov there are three principal works on the collector: Aleksandra Botkina, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov v zhizni i*

⁴³ A. Paramanov, *Nashi muzei. Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia galereia*, Moscow, 1963, p. 9. An earlier guide to the Tret'iakov Gallery presented the activities of the *Peredvizhniki* in the context of a Marxist interpretation of history: 'The society took its exhibitions from town to town; it played an enormous role in the business of acquainting a wider circle of bourgeois society with this art.' L.B. Rozental', *Kratkii putevoditel' po Tret'iakovskoi galleree*, Moscow, 1929, p. 46.

⁴⁴ Talbot Rice, *A Concise History of Russian Art*, p. 233.

⁴⁵ V.V. Stasov (ed.), *Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi: ego zhizn', perepiska i khudozhestvenno-kriticheskie stat'i, 1837-1887*, St. Petersburg, 1888. As well as the 1888 publication this thesis uses S.N. Gol'dstein (ed.), *Perepiska I.N. Kramskogo*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1953-54.

iskusstve, Vera Ziloti, *V dome Tret'iakova* and Irina Nenarokomova, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov i ego galereia*.⁴⁶ The former two works were written by two of Tret'iakov's daughters; the work by Ziloti is of a more anecdotal, than scholarly nature. With reference to the correspondence of writers, Soviet edited volumes of their correspondence have been most useful, and the journal series *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* has additionally provided previously unpublished materials. However unlike Kramskoi, some individuals, particularly painters, did not engage in extensive correspondence in which they discussed the role of art in society or the works of their fellow artists. Unfortunately Vasilii Grigor'evich Perov (1833-1882) is included in this number. Perov produced a number of landmark portraits of Russian writers in the early 1870s but his surviving correspondence with Tret'iakov and other artists is minimal and letters tend to be brief and concerned with the mundane business of painting a portrait – arranging sittings and requesting payment. In describing his feelings to Tret'iakov on the completion of *Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii* (1872), a work that is arguably Perov's most successful portrait and was immediately applauded by critics on its exhibition, Perov merely states that he thinks the portrait (along with one of the writer A.N. Maikov) is 'good, successful' (*portrety khoroshi, udachnye*).⁴⁷ The absence of substantial written material either to or from Perov is also reflected in the fact that no volumes were published devoted to his correspondence; an anomaly for an artist of his stature and reputation.⁴⁸

Soviet scholars involved in the publication of these volumes of correspondence also produced a number of studies of *Peredvizhniki* artists which have proved useful, such as S.N. Gol'dshtein's comprehensive monograph on Kramskoi.⁴⁹ Respected Soviet scholars also contributed to one interesting publishing phenomenon that reflected the continued interest with images of writers and places associated with them. A series of books aimed at Russian

⁴⁶ A.P. Botkina, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov v zhizni i iskusstve*, Moscow, 1993 (first published Moscow, 1951); V. Ziloti, *V dome Tret'iakova*, Moscow, 1998 (first published New York, 1954); I. Nenarokomova, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov i ego galereia*, Moscow, 1998.

⁴⁷ V.G. Perov-P.M. Tret'iakov, 10 May 1872, Z.M. Abramov (ed.), *Pis'ma khudozhnikov Pavlu Mikhailovichu Tret'iakovu 1870-1879*, Moscow, 1968, p. 77.

⁴⁸ There is no equivalent to the aforementioned volumes of Kramskoi's correspondence. However in 1934 a work was published that did contain some correspondence and papers: A.A. Fedorov-Davydov et al. (eds.), *V.G. Perov: Prilozheniia, dokumenty, pis'ma i rasskazy, katalog proizvedenii, bibliografiia*, Moscow, 1934.

⁴⁹ S.N. Gol'dshtein, *Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi zhizn' i tvorchestvo*, Moscow, 1965.

middle school children entitled along the lines of *[name of writer] v portretakh i illiustratsiakh*.⁵⁰ Although these works were aimed at a young audience they provided useful resources for the image collection.

In recent years the most prolific Russian scholars on nineteenth-century Russian artistic life are Grigorii Sternin and Dmitrii Sarabianov. Sternin has written and edited works such as *Tipologiya russkogo realizma vtoroi XIX veka* and 'Pisatel' i khudozhnik v kul'turnoi zhizni Rossii 1870-1880 godov',⁵¹ in which he examines the relationship between writers and artists such as Perov and Kramskoi. Sarabianov, as well as being the author of general works on Russian art, has also written on the concept of individuality in Russian portraiture, which includes reference to portraits of writers.⁵² Overall, general works - both English and Russian - on Russian art usually devote a paragraph or two to Kiprenskii and Tropinin's portraits of Pushkin, and then to the portraiture of the *Peredvizhniki*. But their purpose is only to provide basic information, and for detailed discussions on Russian portraiture from the 1860s onwards, and specifically of writers, one must initially turn to articles and monographs published by Russian (usually Soviet) art historians.

Most studies on the visual representation of Russian writers are in the form of short essays or chapters in books, such as Tat'iana Gorina's article 'Portret A.I. Gertsena',⁵³ or the chapter 'Sobranie Portretov' in Irina Nenarokomova's book on Pavel Tret'iakov.⁵⁴ However there do exist two works particularly relevant to my own research. From the title at least, it may seem that Valerii Turchin's *Portrety russkikh pisatelei v russkoi zhivopisi XIX veka*⁵⁵ has already addressed the subject of my research, however his work is a concise overview of the whole century, from Kiprenskii to Vrubel, and deals only with

⁵⁰ For example, E.F. Gollerbakh (ed.), *N.A. Nekrasov v portretakh i illiustratsiakh*, Leningrad, 1938; A.D. Alekseev (ed.), *I.A. Goncharov v portretakh, illiustratsiakh, dokumentakh*, Leningrad, 1960; V.S. Nechaeva (ed.), *F.A. Dostoevskii v portretakh, illiustratsiakh, dokumentakh*, Moscow, 1972.

⁵¹ G. Sternin, *Khudozhestvennaia zhizn' Rossii vtoroi poloviny XIX veka 70-80e gody*, Moscow, 1997, pp. 96-125.

⁵² D. Sarabianov, 'Lichnost' i individual'nost' v russkoi portretnoi zhivopisi', *Russkaia zhivopis'*. *Probuzhdenie pamiati*, Moscow, 1998, pp. 128-143.

⁵³ T. Gorina, 'Portret A.I. Gertsena', *Khudozhnik*, no.1, 1970, p. 46. Gorina also wrote the chapter on Nikolai Ge in *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta*. One does find that articles and chapters in Soviet art histories are by a small number of scholars, leading to a repetition of information and opinions.

⁵⁴ Nenarokomova, *Pavel Tret'iakov*, pp. 58-96.

⁵⁵ V.S. Turchin, *Portrety russkikh pisatelei v russkoi zhivopisi XIX veka*, Moscow, 1970.

painted portraits. Turchin concentrates on the relationship between artist and writer, rather than consider the wider reception of the works.

One recent work that deserves special attention is Tat'iana Karpova's *Smysl litsa. Russkii portret vtoroi poloviny XIX veka. Opyt samopoznaniia lichnosti*.⁵⁶ The only work of recent years to examine Russian portraiture of the second half of the nineteenth century, it is an outstanding piece of scholarship that focuses on the philosophical questions that surround portrait painting. Karpova examines how the concepts of personality and individuality were manifested in portraiture in accordance with social ideas of the ideal. Unlike this thesis, Karpova limits her study to looking at painted portraits, although she does briefly examine the relationship between the photographic portrait and the painted portrait.

The Reproduction of Representation

In the second half of the nineteenth century portraiture had new demands placed on it, particularly portraits of historical figures, whose success had been recognized by a wider audience. Portraits became part of the ever-expanding visual culture and print culture of the second half of the nineteenth century and as Paul Barlow observes, 'portraiture, then, was drawn into the emerging forms of public communication produced by urban commercial society.'⁵⁷ The importance of portraiture as a means of communication dramatically increased as developments in printing and reproduction gave an even greater audience access to images. As mentioned above, this work not only looks at painted portraits but also at those created and reproduced through engraving, photography and print methods such as lithography and chromolithography. It is not the aim of this work to discuss conflict or competition between photographic and painted portraits, but to recognise them as two different means of visual representation that existed closely and developed alongside one another at this time. There has recently been increased scholarly interest in nineteenth-century Russian photography and print culture. David Elliot offers the only

⁵⁶ T. Karpova, *Smysl litsa. Russkii portret vtoroi poloviny XIX veka. Opyt samopoznaniia lichnosti*, St. Petersburg, 2000.

⁵⁷ P. Barlow, 'Facing the past and present: the National Portrait Gallery and the search for "authentic" portraiture', in *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, pp. 219-238, p. 221.

comprehensive overview in English on photography in *Photography in Russia 1840-1940*.⁵⁸ Works produced by Russian scholars have provided valuable information on the working practises and studios of individual photographers. Moscow photographers are detailed in *Fotografy Moskvy – na pamiat' budushchemu 1839-1930* and a similar study of St. Petersburg photographers is provided by *Peterburgskii al'bom. Fotografii iz kollektsii Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha*.⁵⁹

In reference to print culture, postcards seem to have recently captured Russian scholars' imagination. *Khudozhestvennaia otkrytka russkogo moderna* and *Otkrytye pis'ma serebriannogo veka*⁶⁰ both provided background information on the early years of postcards, many produced to aid the Russian Red Cross. Although picture postcards experienced their golden age in the first two decades of the twentieth century, therefore outside the scope of this study, one of the first picture postcards to be issued in Russia in 1895 contained an image of Pushkin in the form of a picture of the monument erected to him in 1880. One study that proved key to the section on the visual representation of A.S. Pushkin, *'Ia k vam pishu...' Pushkiniana na otkrytkakh XIX-XX vv*⁶¹ was produced not by a scholar, but by a collector of Pushkin postcards and provided an excellent visual inventory of images I had been unable to locate elsewhere. Postcards may be a recent area of study within Russian print culture, but prints and engravings have fascinated Russian scholars and collectors since the nineteenth century. The most celebrated scholar of prints and printing was Dmitrii Aleksandrovich Rovinskii (1824-1895) a jurist, art historian and passionate collector of prints who produced a number of landmark works on the history of printing in Russia. Amongst his works, two have provided detailed information on the existence of engraved portraits and biographical information on artists: *Slovar' russkikh gravirovannykh portretov*, and *Podrobny slovar' russkikh graverov XVI-XIX vv*.⁶²

⁵⁸ D. Elliot, *Photography in Russia 1840-1940*, London, 1992.

⁵⁹ T.N. Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvy-na pamiat' budushchemu 1839-1930*, Moscow, 2001. G.A. Mioliubova & T.A. Petrova, *Peterburgskii al'bom. Fotografii iz kollektsii Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha*, Moscow, 2002.

⁶⁰ M. Nashchokina, *Khudozhestvennaia otkrytka russkogo moderna*, Moscow, 2004. V.P. Tret'iakov, *Otkrytye pis'ma serebriannogo veka*, St. Petersburg, 2000.

⁶¹ M.S. Zaboichen', *'Ia k vam pishu...' Pushkiniana na otkrytkakh XIX-XXvv*, Moscow, 1999.

⁶² D.A. Rovinskii, *Slovar' russkikh gravirovannykh portretov*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1889; *Podrobny slovar' russkikh graverov XVI-XIX vv*, St. Petersburg, 1895.

One source that has proved invaluable for a number of translations of primary documents and information on art critics has been the online research archive: *Russian Visual Arts: Art Criticism in Context, 1814-1909* (<http://hri.shef.ac.uk/rva/>). This website, created and maintained by the Department of Russian, University of Exeter and Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies, University of Sheffield is an unique tool for the research of nineteenth-century Russian art through the databases it provides and the texts it makes accessible.

Studies on A.S. Pushkin

The visual representation of Pushkin, or at least certain areas of it, is an area that has attracted a considerable amount of scholarly attention. One particular work is outstanding in the field and particularly important to this thesis; it is not only a valuable resource, but also an example of how popular and diverse visual representations of Pushkin had become by the end of the nineteenth century. Sigizmund Librovič's *Pushkin v portretakh*⁶³ is quite a remarkable work that attempts to cover all representations of the poet in painting, engraving and sculpture. Librovič not only offers invaluable information on lesser-known images of Pushkin, particularly engravings, but also reflects contemporary attitudes towards the representation of Russia's national poet. Published equidistantly between the unveiling of the monument to Pushkin in Moscow and the national centenary celebrations of his birth, *Pushkin v portretakh* also reflects the growing commercial appeal of Pushkin and the ways in which he was 'celebrated' by manufacturers of consumer goods. Perhaps surprisingly, Librovič, unlike some of his fellow critics, takes a balanced approach to items such as Pushkin vodka bottles (Fig.126) and rather admires the 'peculiar popularity'⁶⁴ they enjoy. The ways in which Pushkin's portrait became a commodity is an area that apart from Librovič's contemporary observations has received little attention. Only one short article by Maria Kublitskaia 'Tepericha Pushkin v mode...'⁶⁵ devotes itself to the topic, accompanied by a handful of

⁶³ S. Librovič, *Pushkin v portretakh. Istoriia izobrazheniia poeta v zhivopisi, graviure, skul'pture* St. Petersburg, 1890.

⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 242.

⁶⁵ M. Kublitskaia, 'Tepericha Pushkin v mode...', in *Doma u Pushkina*, Special edition of *Ars Peterburg, Rossiiskii zhurnal iskusstv*, St. Petersburg, 1994, pp. 91-95.

illustrations. Marcus Levitt's analysis of the Pushkin 1880 Celebrations does briefly refer to commercial images of Pushkin, but his work concentrates on the literary politics that surrounded the event, rather than the actual Pushkin statue and its visual heritage or legacy.⁶⁶ However, through the kind assistance and co-operation of the All-Russian Pushkin Museum, St. Petersburg, this thesis makes available material previously overlooked by western scholars in the study of Pushkin and provides a detailed examination of how Pushkin was presented through advertisements, packaging and product-affiliation.

Usually focusing on the traditional mediums of portrayal, painted portraits and sculpture, a number of studies on Pushkin appeared throughout the twentieth century and continue to be produced today. This thesis has used E.A. Pavlova's *A.S. Pushkin v portretakh*, as a source for pictures⁶⁷ but some earlier studies produced in the 1920s and 1930s offer more detailed investigation into images, such as V.Z. Golubev's *Pushkin v izobrazhenii Repina*,⁶⁸ one of the few works to examine Pushkin's portrayal in the second half of the nineteenth century. One work that was invaluable in assessing the extent to which portraits of Pushkin were published in journals and newspapers was V.A. Adariukov's *Ukazatel' gravirovannykh i litografirovannykh portretov A.S. Pushkina*,⁶⁹ which remains an unequalled source for information on the reproduction of Pushkin's image. In order to appreciate the complexities of the growth of consumerism in the late nineteenth century I turned to two studies, Thomas Richards' *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England. Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914* and Sally West's *Constructing Consumer Culture: Advertising in Imperial Russia to 1914*.⁷⁰ These texts examine the spectacle of advertising and West's work is particularly insightful, providing essential information on a number of the companies which used Pushkin's image and offering some useful case studies of how other national symbols were used in advertising at the end of the nineteenth century.

⁶⁶ M.C. Levitt, *Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880*, New York, 1989.

⁶⁷ E.A. Pavlova, *A.S. Pushkin v portretakh*, Moscow, 1989.

⁶⁸ V.Z. Golubev, *Pushkin v izobrazhenii Repina*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936.

⁶⁹ V.A. Adariukov, *Ukazatel' gravirovannykh i litografirovannykh portretov A.S. Pushkina*, Moscow, 1926.

⁷⁰ T. Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England. Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914*, Stanford, 1990; S. West, *Constructing Consumer Culture: Advertising in Imperial Russia to 1914* (Ph.D. dissertation), Urbana, Illinois, 1995.

Although this thesis is not a comparative study of the representation of Russian and British writers, occasional comparisons with the portrayal of British writers and the activities of British artists are referred to. The depiction of nineteenth-century British writers has been subject to some study, most notably David Piper's work, *The Image of the Poet, British Poets and their Portraits*,⁷¹ a chronicle that begins with portraits of William Shakespeare through to the twentieth-century images of Edith Sitwell and W.B. Yeats. Piper's approach to images of Shakespeare provided this work with a point of departure for the analysis of the images of A.S. Pushkin produced in the second half of the nineteenth century. As well as discussing contemporary images of Shakespeare, Piper examines those images produced after the writer's death, what Piper terms 'after-image'.⁷² As already mentioned we undertake a similar analysis of the 'after-image' of Pushkin. For both these writers, their 'after-image' manifested itself in a wide variety of forms: 'mass-produced forms of engravings just as in pricier paintings or casts; imaginary likenesses; porcelain or pottery bric-à-brac; even statues'.⁷³

Discovering the person behind the play, poem or novel is a fascination for many readers, as Piper simply puts it there is a 'wonder that common persons of flesh and blood can be responsible for producing it, [literature] and so I want to know what they look like.'⁷⁴ In nineteenth-century Russia, writers were revered not only for their individual imaginative and intellectual prowess, but also as living representatives of Russian success. Although in the period 1860-1899 the majority of Russians inhabited the countryside and only had basic literacy skills (if any)⁷⁵ an urban, and increasingly literate, population was steadily growing along with the process of industrialization in Russia. This populace consumed not only a variety of texts, from poetry to pot-boilers, but was exposed to visual culture in a diversity of forms, from paintings in exhibitions to posters in shop windows. This thesis aims to demonstrate how the

⁷¹ D. Piper, *The Image of the Poet, British Poets and their Portraits*, Oxford, 1982.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 147.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁷⁵ Literacy rates amongst the majority of the Russian population (rural inhabitants) were low for the second half of the nineteenth century, 21 percent according to a census in 1897. However, the same census also showed that male literacy rates were high in the industrialized provinces. Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, p. 4.

rise of the Russian writer as a national celebrity was intrinsically linked to the growth of visual culture. It aims to demonstrate how visual representations of writers made a vital contribution to the way their subjects were perceived and received, establishing them in the popular consciousness in roles and with reputations that remain to the present day.

Introduction

In 1757 an Imperial Academy of Arts was established in Russia,⁷⁶ its purpose to produce Russian artists and art to equal those of Western Europe. In order to achieve this aim, the Academy employed foreign tutors and adopted the methods of other European Academies, notably those of the French.⁷⁷ Central to the Academy's teaching and philosophy was the belief in a hierarchy of genres within the subject matter of painting; a work's ranking was dependent on the emotional and morally beneficial message it conveyed and the uplifting response it produced in the viewer. By the 1790s an order of genres had emerged that placed history painting first, followed by other subject matter – portraiture, 'domestic genre', battle scenes, buildings, ruins, sea-scapes, landscapes, and finally animals, birds, flowers, fruit and vegetables, although the ranking of these subjects was not rigidly fixed. To produce a successful painting based on a historical or biblical subject and to be awarded the Academy's gold medal became the cherished goal of all students, and, as the Academy was the only official art school in Russia until 1843, of all Russian artists.⁷⁸ However, although winning the gold medal awarded its recipient a *pension* abroad, history painting was not the most commercial or popular genre of art in Russia. As Rosalind Gray points out, in the first half of the nineteenth century history painting's importance was a theoretical one, and it was 'portraiture [that] proved to be both popular with and commercially profitable for many of the institution's most lauded alumni.'⁷⁹ A history painting - *The Last Day of Pompeii* (*Poslednii den' Pompei*) (1830-33) - may have brought Karl Pavlovich Briullov (1799-

⁷⁶ Initially the Academy was created as part of Moscow University, but in 1763 Catherine II separated it from the University and reorganized it, establishing the post of Academy President and in the following year granting Academicians noble status of varying ranks.

⁷⁷ See Gray's comments on the role of the French Academy as a model for the Russian one. R. P. Gray, *Russian Genre Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford, 2000, pp. 1-3. Also, I. Tartarinova, 'The Pedagogic Power of the Master. The Studio System at the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts in St. Petersburg', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 83, no.3, July 2005, pp. 470-489. For an overview of European academies in the nineteenth century see D.R. Cardoso & C. Trodd (eds.), *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century*, Manchester, 2000.

⁷⁸ In 1843 the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture was established, see N. Dmitrieva, *Moskovskoe uchilishche zhivopisi, vaianiia i zodchestva*, Moscow, 1951. There were also a few schools set up in the Russian provinces to teach peasants and serfs. The most famous of these was run by the painter Aleksei Venetsianov (1780-1847) on his estate in Tver in the 1820s to 1840s.

⁷⁹ Gray, *Russian Genre Painting*, p. 6.

1852), international renown, but it was portraiture that brought him, and his fellow Academicians, financial gain.⁸⁰

Of all genres, portraiture has arguably been the most dominant and the most flourishing in the history of Russian art. This was largely due to the role played by imperial and aristocratic patronage; members of the imperial court required portraits of themselves and their families to promote reputations based on power, wealth and sophistication in line with Western European standards. However, as early as the 1730s a few Russian artists also produced portraits that displayed a painterly sophistication in the representation of the subject's psyche, as well as their physiognomy. The finest example of sophisticated early Russian portraiture is undoubtedly *Portrait of a Hetman / Self Portrait* (c.1731) (Fig. 1) by Ivan Nikitich Nikitin (c.1680-1742?), a work which has recently been the subject of scholarly scrutiny,⁸¹ and which is Nikitin's greatest achievement. It has been said of Nikitin that he was Russia's first portraitist, but this is a debatable point. Nikitin, who studied in Italy, was certainly the first Russian portrait painter in a Western European sense, but that is not to say portraiture did not exist in pre-Petrine Russia. As James Cracraft points out there was 'a growing appetite for portraiture at the late Muscovite court'⁸² and a few Russians were already being exposed to European art from the middle of the seventeenth century, especially after the annexation of left bank Ukraine in 1654. However, this appetite was limited to the tsar's court and a handful of nobles such as Vasilii Vasil'evich Golitsyn (1643-1714) and the quality of Russian portraiture may appear naïve and unsophisticated when compared to European equivalents such as the work of Van Dyck (1599-1641) Velazquez (1599-1660) or Rembrandt (1606-69).

Examples of early Russian portraiture range from the funerary 'portrait' of Prince M.V. Skopin-Shuiskii (1620s-30s), which should be seen as a kind of

⁸⁰ Briullov was an accomplished portrait painter who presented a variety of figures in his works. These included society beauties, such as his double portrait of the Shishmarev sisters (1839) and Russian writers, including N.V. Kulokol'nik (1836) and Krylov (1839). See M. Rakova, 'K.P. Briullov-portretist', in E.N. Galinka (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Pervoi poloviny XIX veka*, pp. 176-223.

⁸¹ The debate surrounds the subject of the portrait - Hetman or Nikitin - and recently the Russian scholar S.O. Androsova has credibly argued for the latter. See S.O. Androsova, *Zhivopisets Ivan Nikitin*, St. Petersburg, 1998 and L. Hughes' review of the work in the *Newsletter of the Study Group on 18th Century Russia*, no. 27, 1999, pp. 56-62.

⁸² J. Cracraft, *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery*, Chicago, 1997, p. 190.

‘secular icon’ in terms of painterly style and medium (tempera on panel), to more ‘lifelike’ portraits such as a series of images of early members of Peter I’s All-Drunken Assembly, known as the *Preobrazhenskoe Palace Portraits* (1690s).⁸³ However, all portraits produced by Russians in the seventeenth century reflect in some way Russia’s artistic heritage of icon painting.⁸⁴ In the above case of Prince Skopin-Shuiskii’s image, the legacy is quite apparent, but even after the introduction of European art to Russia, the characteristics of icon painting continued to be prevalent in Russian portraiture. This is no criticism and *parsuna* portraits, as these works are known (from the Polish), are some of the most enchanting images in Russian painting. The characteristics of *parsuna* style - very little pictorial perspective, a ‘static, flattened representation’⁸⁵, the facial features depicted by means of precise lines rather than shadow and light - resonate in Russian portraiture throughout the eighteenth century. One of the best examples of this is the *Portrait of Sarah Fermor* (c. 1750) by Ivan Iakovlevich Vishniakov (1699- 1761). This visual heritage of the icon is a point to keep in mind when examining portraits of writers from the second half of the nineteenth century; the manner in which some Russian writers were depicted arguably has points of reference in medieval and Orthodox art.⁸⁶

Nikitin was a product of the programme of westernisation and secularisation of Russian life and culture initiated by Peter I at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries. In respect to portraiture, Peter’s inaugural action was to be the subject of ‘the first painting of a Russian ruler [...] made from life wholly in the Western manner’⁸⁷ by Sir Godfrey Kneller in 1698 during the tsar’s Grand Embassy of Europe. Peter encouraged (or ordered) the use of portraiture among the Russian nobility to promote an image of Russians as Europeans. European artists executed some of the most

⁸³ L. Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, New Haven, 1998, pp. 251-252.

⁸⁴ For a detailed discussion on the condition of icon painting and Russian portraiture in the seventeenth century see L. Hughes, ‘Images of the Elite: A Reconsideration of the Portrait in Seventeenth-Century Russia’, *Von Moskau nach St. Petersburg: Das russische Reich im 17. Jahrhundert (Forschungen sur osteuropäischen Geschichte)*, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp. 167-185.

⁸⁵ G. Ivashevskaja, *Portraiture*, Leningrad, 1991, p. 9.

⁸⁶ Karpova directly makes an association between *Peredvizhniki* portraits of writers and medieval religious imagery. She compares Kramskoi’s *Portrait of Saltykov-Shchedrin* (1879) with an image of ‘Christ the Pantocrator from a Novgorod fresco’. T. Karpova, *Smysl litsa. Russkii portret vtoroi poloviny XIX veka. Opyt samopoznaniia lichnosti*, St. Petersburg, 2000, p. 60.

⁸⁷ Hughes, ‘Images of the Elite’, p. 176.

famous images of Peter and his family,⁸⁸ and they, together with Russian portraitists such as Nikitin and Andrei Matveevich Matveev (1701-39) provided the foundation for the development of Russian portraiture. Peter's motives for educating and training Russian artists in the ways and methods of European art – including study abroad – may have been based on the needs of the state rather than aesthetic inclination, but his actions established portrait painting as the principal genre within Russian art. During Peter's reign portraits primarily had to display the success and sophistication of their subjects, Russia's 'new' nobility, and this was achieved by the inclusion in portraits of military orders and medals, European fashion in dress and grooming, classical settings and the use of allegorical motifs. Accessories and symbols of status and power were of equal, if not greater importance, to the depiction of a good physical likeness or the representation of something of the subject's personality. Although Nikitin depicted something of the psyche of his subject in *Portrait of a Hetman / Self Portrait*, it would not be until the second half of the eighteenth century that Russian portraits (of men) begin to appear that represent something of their subject's intellectual accomplishment and achievement, rather than simply military or governmental success.

Early Representations of Intellect

Throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries portraitists continued to rely heavily on imperial and aristocratic patronage. Even *Peredvizhniki* artists accepted commissions from Russia's oldest and most powerful families, a fact often overlooked in Soviet studies of their work.⁸⁹ Although the aim of many of these 'noble' portraits was primarily to depict their female subjects as beautiful and virtuous and their male subjects as virile and holders of official power (military or civil) there are a few portraits whose subject wanted their intellectual ability or tendencies represented too. D.G. Levitskii was one of a

⁸⁸ For example J.G. Dannhauer, *Peter I at Poltava*, (1710s), J.M. Nattier, *Tsaritsa Catherine Alekseevna*, (1717) and Louis Caravaque, *Anna and Elizabeth Petrovna*, (1717).

⁸⁹ One of the most famous members of the *Peredvizhniki* was Il'ia Efimovich Repin (1844-1930) whose close ties to the Imperial family Valkenier makes reference to. E.K. Valkenier, *Ilya Repin and the World of Russian Art*, New York, 1990, p. 40. Not only did Repin create one of the most impressive images of Russian autocratic power in his 1885 picture of Aleksandr III addressing a group of village elders, but the work that first brought the artist to the public's attention, *Volga*

number of gifted portraitists working in late eighteenth-century St. Petersburg and he was particularly fortunate in obtaining slightly unusual commissions. He famously depicted pupils of the Smolny Institute for noble girls (1773-1776) but of more relevance here is his portrait of the industrialist and philanthropist Prokofiy Akinfievich Demidov (1773) (Fig. 2).

Levitskii's portrait is of a man whose family had gained their noble status under Peter I due to their production of guns and ammunitions for the Russian State.⁹⁰ The Demidovs were among the first Russian industrialists and established metallurgical plants in the Urals, but Prokofiy Akinfievich was known as much for his interests outside of industry. He established a commercial school in St. Petersburg, in addition to a number of charitable institutions and was known amongst his contemporaries as 'the great inquisitor' ('*velikii kur'eznik*').⁹¹ This nickname is reflected in Levitskii's portrait in which Demidov is presented as a man engaged in mental and scientific activities, a member of an enlightened European milieu.

The portrait is a complex composition, as both the sitter and his surroundings vie for the viewer's attention. The informal appearance of Demidov 'en dishabille' in his unstructured coat or dressing gown, was a convention common to eighteenth-century European portraiture, used by painters to indicate their subject's confidence and concern with matters of intellect, rather than day-to-day business. Demidov's dress mirrors the appearance of the French *philosophe* Denis Diderot (1713-84), also painted by Levitskii in 1773. Whether the *Portrait of P.A. Demidov* was executed after that of Diderot, and if so, whether Demidov was aware of the Frenchman's attire, is impossible to say without further research. Nevertheless, with the addition of a velvet turban-like hat, a watering can, some potted plants, and some books (on botany?) Levitskii presents us with the figure of a rich, slightly eccentric, European botanist rather than a rich, successful industrialist. The only hint of the subject's professional identity is the depiction of the School of Commerce faintly in the background.

Bargehaulers (1873), was purchased for 3,000 roubles by Grand Duke Vladimir Aleksandrovich, vice-president of the Imperial Academy.

⁹⁰ Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, p. 157.

⁹¹ O. Allenova, *Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia galereia. Putevoditel'*, Moscow, 1997, p. 46.

Levitskii's painting not only displays the subject's intellectual horizons through his scientific and practical interest in plants; it also combines both his professional and personal identities. Therefore, although *Portrait of D.A. Demidov* is not a representation of a writer, it is one of the earliest attempts in Russian portraiture to represent the personal identity of the sitter with respect to his intellectual talent and pursuits.

The reign of Catherine II (1762-1796) witnessed the emergence of individuals who were recognized in Russian urban society as writers, both of non-fiction works (such as history) and literature.⁹² Catherine herself was an avid reader, and writer of articles and plays, and her patronage of writers 'made literature and drama respectable'.⁹³ A number of newspapers and journals appeared at this time and one can identify a small but definite 'imagined community' of Russian readers. It would be helpful here to turn to Geoffrey Hosking's points on the role of literature as 'nation-builder' in Russia. Hosking argues, using Benedict Anderson's theory, that in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries the emergence of private printing and publishing in Russia led to the creation and maintenance of an audience of readers, 'a new form of imagined community'.⁹⁴ So what of the representatives of this new community and their visual representation? The poet Gavril Romanovich Derzhavin (1743-1816) was depicted by V. L. Borovikovskii in a portrait (1795) (Fig. 3) that relies heavily on the use of background and accessories to represent the subject's two professional identities, writer and state servitor. Derzhavin had been a soldier - he was involved in the campaign against Pugachev - a regional governor, and for a short while a private secretary to the Empress, and in his smart dress, powdered wig and imperial orders he appears every inch a member of the imperial court. Despite the view that Derzhavin 'was a genuine poet, not a politician, a courtier or a bureaucrat',⁹⁵ his outward appearance and presentation by Borovikovskii place himself visually within this official milieu. However, the background and foreground depict the contradictions in

⁹² See W.E. Brown, *A History of Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature*, Ann Arbor, 1980.

⁹³ I. de Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great*, New Haven & London, 1981, p. 548.

⁹⁴ B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, London, 1991 quoted in G. Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire, 1552-1917*, London, 1997, p. 289.

⁹⁵ Madariaga, *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great*, p. 540.

Derzhavin's professional identity. Behind the poet's left shoulder we see shelves of leather bound books and the small face of an owl, the earthly representative of Athena, the Greek goddess of wisdom. By Derzhavin's left arm is an ink well and quill and he points to piles of booklets, most likely copies of his poems. As with the portrait of Demidov, there is evidence of his mental and creative abilities, but Derzhavin is not shown in the process of writing, a convention maintained, with a few notable exceptions, in the depiction of writers in the nineteenth century. Derzhavin is also placed in a setting common to many portraits of noted eighteenth-century figures. He sits on a grand looking chair, behind him hangs a curtain or some form of drapery and over his right shoulder through an open window can be seen a ship from the Russian fleet, a reference perhaps, to Russia's recent victory in the Russo-Turkish war. If imperial medals, flags and military might define the subject's national identity, what of his personality, his emotions and spirit? These are overshadowed in the portrait by the surroundings and accessories; Derzhavin exudes a quite confidence perhaps, but the portrait emits no creative energy from its sitter.

Other late eighteenth-century portraits of writers also conform to the means of representation outlined in the portrait of Derzhavin, external symbols of success taking precedence over the inner qualities of the sitter. One notable exception to this, and a work that is something of a bridge between the portraiture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, is Levitskii's portrait of the writer Nikolai Ivanovich Novikov (1744-1818) (Fig. 4). The painting is dated at 1796 or 1797, although this seems somewhat early and the work has far more in common with early nineteenth-century painting than that of late eighteenth century - it seems to fit comfortably within the 'Romantic' tradition of portrait painting. The representation of the 'inner' qualities of an individual, in our case writers, was a fundamental part of the Romantic Movement in art, which 'found in Russia particularly fertile soil for its growth and development'⁹⁶ primarily in portrait painting. Hugh Honour provides an excellent description of the general attributes of a 'Romantic' portrait of a creative individual - a painter, writer or musician. 'They preferred to appear, with lightly tousled hair, Byronic open-necked shirts or loosely tied cravats, good though never showy clothes

⁹⁶ Ivashevskaja, *Portraiture*, p. 10.

negligently worn, as men of intellect and sensibility, members of the republic of arts and letters'.⁹⁷ Visual representations of writers that conform this Romantic style are especially prevalent in British portraiture, for example Henry Raeburn's *Sir Walter Scott* (1808) or Richard Westall's *Byron* (1813)⁹⁸. Levitskii's portrait of Novikov can also be placed within this tradition and represents the personal identity of an individual, rather than a subject whose identity is presented through external symbols of their position in society and their relationship to holders of greater power. The absence of any imperial orders or medals is not surprising given Novikov's relationship to Catherine and the Russian State. Novikov rejected a career in the military or civil service and instead established the satirical journal *The Drone* (*Truten*'), amongst others. Yet it was not his publishing ventures, but his alleged involvement in Freemasonry and his respect for Catherine's son Paul, which led to his arrest and exile (overturned on the accession of Paul to the throne).⁹⁹

Rather than Derzhavin's formal attire and powdered wig, Novikov is presented in smart, but more relaxed dress and it would appear without a wig. Novikov's appearance is more in keeping with the dress we see in later portraits of A.S. Pushkin and other writers of the 1820s. Instead of a cluttered background, Levitskii presents us with rolling, darkening clouds, a common feature in Romantic painting. However, it is the basic composition of the portrait and the placement of the subject that marks this portrait out in the development of the visual representation of writers. Levitskii concentrates on the head and shoulders rather than the whole body; Novikov's face fills far more of the canvas than Derzhavin's, who's chest, decorated with imperial orders, is at the central point of Borovikovskii's portrait. Novikov's right hand is visible, but Levitskii uses it not to indicate evidence of the writer's creativity but to form a relationship with the viewer; the hand seems to gesture to the viewer, to draw them into the portrait. Although this portrait was painted after Novikov's imprisonment and exile it does not explicitly represent the subject's suffering, but nevertheless there is melancholy in Novikov's expression, particularly in the

⁹⁷ H. Honour, *Romanticism*, London, 1991, p. 249.

⁹⁸ For an examination of the Romantic image of the British writer see D. Piper, *The Image of the Poet, British Poets and their Portraits*, Oxford, 1982, pp. 91-145.

⁹⁹ On the life and literary career of Novikov see W.G. Jones, *Nikolai Novikov: Enlightener of Russia*, Cambridge, 1984.

heaviness of the eyes. Levitskii has attempted to represent a thoughtful individual, his turbulent recent past reflected in clouds behind him. From his dress we cannot tell the nationality of the subject nor does he display awards of service to country or ruler, it is his personal identity that Levitskii focuses on, his inner abilities which in the past had brought the writer success.

Throughout the first three decades of the nineteenth century Russian writers continued to be presented in a Romantic fashion. The most famous examples are O.A. Kiprenskii's *Portrait of V.A. Zhukovskii*, (1816) (Fig. 5) and his *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin* (1827) (Fig. 93) and K.P. Briullov's *Portrait of N.V. Kukol'nik* (1836). Kiprenskii's portrait of Pushkin is discussed at greater length in part two of this thesis, but a portrait that is the epitome of the Romantic representation of the Russian writer is Kiprenskii's earlier portrait of the poet and translator Vasilii Andreevich Zhukovskii (1783-1852). As with Levitskii's depiction of Novikov, Kiprenskii is concerned to present not only the physical likeness of his subject, but also his emotional and mental condition.

As in Kiprenskii's portrait of Pushkin, Zhukovskii's stare avoids the viewer's gaze, but his face reflects a melancholic mood, rather than the air of petulance that surrounds Pushkin. His tousled hair and thoughtful pose, leaning on his right hand seem to indicate an individual removed from society, rather than against it. However, the major difference between the portraits of Zhukovskii and Pushkin lies in the setting. Kiprenskii places Zhukovskii against a bleak and windswept countryside, instead of a statuette, ruins can be made out to the right of the subject's shoulder. In the use of this background Kiprenskii evokes the spirit of Zhukovskii's ballads and his translations of German and British writers.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, the placing of Zhukovskii amongst nature and ruined buildings heightens the atmosphere of the subject's alienation, he is not placed inside an apartment or salon, and he is not part of urban or urbane Russian society. Kiprenskii himself was for many years alienated from Russia, spending most of his career in Italy, and Sarabianov argues that the painter

¹⁰⁰ V.S. Turchin begins *Portrety russkikh pisatelei v russkoi zhivopisi XIX veka*, Moscow, 1970 by discussing the portrait of Zhukovskii and points out that the 'portrait supposes the viewer has a knowledge of the poetics of Romanticism and Zhukovskii's works, such as the first of his poems *Country Graveyard* (*Sel'skoe kladbishche*) and the later poem 'A detailed report about the moon' (*Podrobnogo otcheta o lune*) in which he gave a series of accounts about the night landscape.' p. 17.

‘often lent his subjects aspects of his own personality’.¹⁰¹ This portrait is a representation of an isolated individual and there is certainly no visual point of reference to national identity. Kiprenskii’s belief that ‘behaviour and outward appearance could be made to reveal the unique character within’¹⁰² is clearly achieved in this portrait, but the representation of writers as individuals somewhat isolated from the society they are so lauded by, continues throughout the nineteenth century. It is further exaggerated in the portraiture of the *Peredvizhniki* by the absence of any discernible background or setting. Two writers whose visual representations were established in the 1820s and 1830s and which continued to be present in the public arena throughout the nineteenth century are those of A.S. Pushkin and M.Iu. Lermontov. The visual representation of Pushkin and its resonance throughout the nineteenth century is discussed in part two of this thesis. As regards Lermontov, many portraits of the writer continued to be created and reproduced after his death, both one-off painted portraits and mass-produced printed ones. For example, P.M. Tret’iakov commissioned V.G. Perov to make a copy of the 1837 portrait of Lermontov by Petr Efimovich Zabolotskii (1803-1866)¹⁰³ and engraved portraits of the writer regularly appeared in illustrated journals and publications. Figs. 6 and 7 show two covers from the illustrated journal *Pictorial Review (Zhivopisnoe obozrenie)*, from the 1880s and 1890s which featured the same portrait of Lermontov.¹⁰⁴ This representation of Lermontov is typical of those of this era; nearly all images of the writer presented his professional identity as a military one.¹⁰⁵ The aforementioned portrait taken from life by Zabolotskii established Lermontov’s professional identity and the particular military iconography associated with the writer. Zabolotskii’s portrait is not technically brilliant; in fact, it could be considered rather naïve. However, it served as the basis for other

¹⁰¹ D.V. Sarabianov, *Russian Art from Neoclassicism to the Avant Garde*, New York, 1990, p. 28.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ *Katalog khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii gorodskoi gallerei Pavla i Sergeia Tret'iakovykh*, Moscow, 1917, p. 36.

¹⁰⁴ *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 41, 8 October 1889 and no. 28, 14 July 1891.

¹⁰⁵ However, there were exceptions. The collection of portraits and biographies published under the title *Russkie deiateli v portretakh, gravirovannykh akademikom Lavrentiem Seriaikovym*, 5 vols. St. Petersburg, 1882-1890, featured in vol. II, 1886, a profile portrait of Lermontov in a cap engraved by I.I. Matiushin, p. 91. This was taken from an original sketch by D.P. Plenev in

subsequent images, as Lermontov's ornate military uniform provided the means for later portraits to be instantly recognized as representations of the writer, whatever the skill in their execution. Lermontov was, of course, an officer who served in the Caucasus as well as a writer, and his representation in military uniform not only indicates this, but also associates Lermontov with his most famous prose work *A Hero of Our Times* (*Geroi nashego vremeni*) (1840) and its hero, Pechorin. Orlando Figes makes this association more explicitly, when commenting upon a self-portrait by Lermontov (who was also an amateur artist) which shows the writer in both Russian Guards uniform and a Caucasian cloak, grasping a Circassian sword. Figes observes that 'the same mixed identity, semi-Russian and semi-Asiatic, was assigned by Lermontov to Pechorin'.¹⁰⁶ Associating a visual representation of a writer with one or other of his fictitious characters is all too easy to do, particularly in hindsight. In the case of Zabolotskii's portrait of Lermontov, the writer had not even begun *Hero of Our Times* so the artist could not have made reference to Pechorin in his portrait of the writer/officer. However, the subsequent success of this representation undoubtedly relied in part on the association an audience made in their own minds between Lermontov and his literary works – his two professional identities of writer and officer united with one another and the work he created as the former, embodied in the representation of the latter. The association of works of fiction with their author, through the visual representation of the latter, can be seen to continue in the portraiture of the *Peredvizhniki*. The most notable example is I.N. Kramskoi's portrait of L.N. Tolstoi and its resonance with the semi-autobiographical character of Levin from *Anna Karenina*, (1877) the novel Tolstoi was at work on when painted by Kramskoi.¹⁰⁷

1840. This drawing is reproduced in E.A. Kovalevskaia & V.A. Maniulov (comps.), *M.Iu. Lermontov v portretakh, illiustratsiakh, dokumentakh*, Leningrad, 1959, p. 278.

¹⁰⁶ O. Figes, *Natasha's Dance. A Cultural History of Russia*, London, 2002, p. 388.

¹⁰⁷ *Anna Karenina* was written between 1873 and 1877, therefore Kramskoi's portrait was executed whilst the book was in its early stages of development and according to A.N. Wilson, before the character of Levin was introduced. Wilson comments that 'No one can fail to see that Levin is an autobiographical figure, and the extent to which this novel is a mere substitute for the journals which Tolstoy was not at the time keeping is aesthetically astonishing.' A.N. Wilson, *Tolstoy*, London, 2001, pp. 278-279.

Both Lermontov and Pushkin were subjected to restrictions placed on their personal freedom by the tsarist authorities¹⁰⁸ and the reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855) was characterized by autocratic government, heavy censorship and a suspicion of 'any manifestation of civil society – philanthropy, educational initiatives, the formation of interest groups and voluntary associations- seeing in them the progenitors of subversion.'¹⁰⁹ Yet the first half of the nineteenth century and the reigns of Aleksandr I (1801-1825) and his brother Nicholas should not be seen solely as a time of oppression by the authorities. The 1820s to 1830s saw the development of a Russian intelligentsia¹¹⁰ and as a direct result of this, the continued, though slow, growth of publishing, journalism, and the rise of the writer as a known figure amongst a small, but emerging, community of readers.

Although the tsarist authorities restricted private publishing in Russia,¹¹¹ progress in publishing and journalism, especially relevant to this thesis, did take place between 1801 and 1855. With reference to technical matters, in 1816 the first lithography workshop was established in St. Petersburg, followed in 1822 with one in Moscow.¹¹² But it was in journalism that the most significant development took place, in particular the emergence of art criticism as a form of journalism and the first designated journals concerned with the Fine Arts. The development of art criticism in the first half of the nineteenth century has been examined recently by a number of scholars: Rosalind Gray, Carol Adlam and Alexei Makhrov.¹¹³ Makhrov is particularly interested in the emergence not only

¹⁰⁸ Both writers were exiled by the tsarist authorities as a result of their work. In 1820 Pushkin was sent to the south of Russia, Kishinev and Odessa. In 1837 Lermontov was transferred to a guards regiment in the Caucasus, a move which in time was fundamental to the development of his literary career.

¹⁰⁹ Hosking, *Russia: People and Empire*, p. 291.

¹¹⁰ See N. Riasanovsky, 'Notes on the Emergence and Nature of the Russian Intelligentsia', in T. Stavrou (ed.), *Art and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, pp. 3-25. Also R. Pipes (ed.), *The Russian Intelligentsia*, New York, 1961.

¹¹¹ In 1804 Aleksandr I placed the Ministry of Education in charge of censorship control and in the early years of his reign censorship was not so restrictive. However, in 1826 Nicholas I introduced a harsh new censorship code, which although revised in 1828 'was severe on works of literature, besides displaying the usual intolerance for periodicals.' M. Beaven Remnek, 'Publishing under Nicholas I (1825-1855)', in M. Beaven Remnek (ed.), *Books in Russia and the Soviet Union*, Wiesbaden, 1991, pp. 31-37, p. 31. See also, L. McReynolds, *The News Under Russia's Old Regime*, Princeton, 1991, pp. 22-23.

¹¹² M. Beaven Remnek, 'Publishing under Alexander I (1801-1825)', in *Books in Russia and the Soviet Union*, pp. 24-30, p. 27.

¹¹³ Gray examines the growth of art journals and criticism of genre painting in the first half of the nineteenth century in the chapter 'The Intelligentsia and the Press', *Russian Genre Painting*, pp.

of the art critic, but also his reader, and notes that Russian art criticism in the period 1804 to 1855 was somewhat paradoxical in nature. Although it 'coincided with the formation of public opinion and the middle class' and art critics attempted to aim their articles at this new readership 'the public was also a source of their disappointment [...] art critics still found it difficult [...] to find an appropriate audience.'¹¹⁴ This observation remains pertinent when we address art criticism of the 1870s onwards. The behaviour and expectations of exhibition audiences and readers of reviews was often disparagingly commented upon by critics, or reflected in the type of article they produced.

The last decade of Nicholas' reign saw the beginnings of monumental changes to Russian literature and art and a conscious effort to depict national themes and scenes from every day life occurred almost simultaneously within the work of painters and writers. The late 1840s are generally regarded as the beginning of the realist school in Russian literature with the publication of early works by Dostoevskii, Turgenev, Goncharov and others.¹¹⁵ In art, the foundations of realism were also being laid, namely in the satirical paintings of Pavel Andreevich Fedotov (1815-1852). Fedotov's compositions, melodramatic scenes of urban Russian life such as *The Major's Courtship* (*Svatovstvo maiora*) (1848) and *The Fresh Cavalier* (*Svezhii kavalier*) (1846) - have a theatrical feel to them which paralleled the 'theatrical technique in the portrayal of character'¹¹⁶ present in much literary work of the 1840s and 1850s. Valkenier notes that the connection between art and literature was observed by contemporary critics. A.N. Maikov reviewing the 1849 Academy exhibition for

45-68. C. Adlam provides a detailed examination of the concept of 'realism' in Russian art criticism in 'Realist Aesthetics in Nineteenth-Century Russian Art Writing', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 83, no. 4, October 2005, pp. 1-26. A. Makhrov provides a useful historical overview of Russian art criticism and its relationship with its readership in 'The Pioneers of Russian Art Criticism: Between State and Public Opinion, 1804-1855', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 81, no. 4, July 2003, pp. 614-633.

¹¹⁴ Makhrov, 'The Pioneers of Russian Art Criticism', p. 633.

¹¹⁵ In the 1840s the following publications appeared. Dostoevskii: *Poor Folk* (*Bednye liudi*) (1846), *The Double* (*Dvoynik*) (1846), *White Nights* (*Belye nochi*) (1848); Turgenev: *Sportsman's Sketches* (*Zapiski okhotnika*) (1847-51); Goncharov: *A Common Story* (*Obyknovennaia istoriia*) (1847).

¹¹⁶ R. Freeborn, *The Rise of the Russian Novel*, Cambridge, 1973, p. 119. In particular, the works of Gogol and Dostoevskii are mirrored in the scenes that Fedotov presented. Freeborn claims that 'the *skandal* scene, obviously owing so much to theatrical convention, became his (Dostoevskii) province in a way no other writer could match.' The same could be said for Fedotov in relation to genre painting.

the journal *The Contemporary* (*Sovremennik*) ‘coupled the three genre scenes [by Fedotov] [...] with the new “democratic” trend in literature’.¹¹⁷

Rosalind Gray defines Fedotov as a ‘Romantic Realist’ a term that neatly reflects the transitional condition of Russian painting in the 1840s and 1850s, a period that saw portrait painting lose its dominant position in Russian art. Of course portraiture continued to be commercially successful, but it no longer seemed to be the force in painting it once was. This trend would continue into the 1860s, with the rise of socially realistic (and sometimes critical) genre paintings. A landmark event in the rise of genre painting was not the creation of a picture, but a text, Nikolai Chernyshevskii’s 1855 Master’s thesis, *Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality* (*Esteticheskie otnosheniia iskusstva k deistvitel’nosti*). In this work, Chernyshevskii (1828-89) argued that art must have a utilitarian basis: ‘It must alleviate suffering, either by drawing attention to it or by impugning the social or political framework that caused it’.¹¹⁸ Gray observes that Chernyshevskii’s theory had ‘an incalculable effect on an entire generation of artists’.¹¹⁹ This is undoubtedly true, but it would be wrong to consider this generation, painters such as Perov, Kramskoi and Ge, as political radicals, like Chernyshevskii.¹²⁰ On the whole these artists were, like the majority of Russian intellectuals, political liberals whose agenda of reforms was concerned with the way in which their work was exhibited and sold, and with improving the status of artists in Russian society; they were professionals who were often from the provinces, poorly educated and once they had graduated from the Academy, awarded the lowest position in the Table of Ranks. The 1860s saw a number of artists in Russia try to better their professional and social position. Although formally established in 1870, the beginnings of the *Peredvizhniki* date back to 1863, when fourteen art students left the Imperial Academy of Arts and joined together to form an *Artel*, an idealistic community

¹¹⁷ E.K. Valkenier, ‘The Intelligentsia and Art’, in T.G. Stavrou (ed.), *Art and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, Bloomington, 1983, pp. 153-171, p. 158.

¹¹⁸ Gray, *Russian Genre Painting*, p. 9.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Artists it seems, were often annoyed by intellectuals ‘hijacking’ their particular means of creative expression. In a letter to his fellow painter Kramskoi, Repin would later exclaim: ‘May God at least save Russian art from corrosive analysis! When will it finally force its way out of that fog! It is a terrible disadvantage fettering it to barren accuracy of etching-tool and brush in technique and to rational concepts, ideas drawn from the mine of political economy.’ Repin-

in which they lived and worked together, pooling their resources and earnings. The reason behind the students' dissatisfaction with the Academy was purportedly the subject matter for the 1863 Academy major gold medal competition: 'Valhalla, from Scandinavian Mythology', but underlying the students' protest was a deeper resentment towards the stranglehold the Academy had on the Russian art world and the lack of opportunities available for professional artists to work and exhibit in Russia independently from the Academy.¹²¹ The development by Russian artists of their own professional position went hand-in-hand with developments in painting; this period not only saw a call for works of art to reflect society, but nationality as well. Indeed in the 1860s the depiction of 'Russianness' 'consisted of reflecting the domestic scene'.¹²²

The students' rejection of the Academy and their subsequent decision to try and operate independently, firstly in an *Artel'* and then as the *Peredvizhniki* should be seen as part of the greater changes affecting Russian society in the 1860s. Developments in Russian art in the 1860s and 1870s occurred against the background of the reforms of Aleksandr II (1855-1881) beginning with the emancipation of the Serfs in 1861 and the subsequent disillusionment of radical opinion with the authorities' incomplete solutions. The abolition of serfdom was followed by the establishment of the Zemstvos (1864) and the reform of the courts (1864)¹²³ but in relation to this thesis the most significant reform was to the censorship of the press. In 1865 the tsar revised the censorship laws affecting publishing in Russia, and 'made possible the first step toward developing a mass-circulation press along the same lines as that in the West'.¹²⁴ As McReynolds discusses in her study of Russian newspaper publishing, there were

Kramskoi, 1879, quoted in M. Gorlin, 'The Interrelation of Painting and Literature in Russia', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 23, 1946-47, pp. 134-148, p. 134.

¹²¹ It should be noted that even artists who wanted to work away from the Academy did not reject it entirely. Perov was a founding member of the *Peredvizhniki* but was also made a professor of the Academy in 1870 and in 1871 he began to teach at the Moscow School of Painting and Sculpture. On the life and career of Perov see N.P. Sobko, *Vasilii Grigor'evich Perov*, St. Petersburg, 1892, and A.A. Fedorov-Davydov et al. (eds.), *V.G. Perov. Prilozheniia: dokumenty, pis'ma i rasskazy, katalog proizvedenii, bibliografiia*, Moscow, 1934.

¹²² E.K. Valkenier, 'The Peredvizhniki and the Spirit of the 1860s', *Russian Review*, no. 34, 1974, pp. 247-265, p. 257.

¹²³ See B. Eklof et al. (eds.), *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*, Bloomington, 1994.

¹²⁴ McReynolds, *The News Under Russia's Old Regime*, p. 23.

problems with the 1865 censorship code and ‘the rules could change at whim’¹²⁵ but overall it gave publishers and editors greater freedom to operate and along with technical developments in printing methods, facilitated a rise in journals and newspapers between 1860 and 1880.¹²⁶

Changes in publishing also had a great effect on the visual representation of Russian writers at this time. Not only did illustrated publications offer an opportunity for readers to see images of writers, as well as read their works and read about them, perhaps more importantly, the growth and evolution of Russian journalism provided readers with the means to read about exhibitions and portraits. In her examination of the rise of the *feuilleton* in Russian journalism,¹²⁷ Katia Dianina reflects that two phenomena associated with the Great Reforms were at the centre of the *feuilleton*’s success ‘the rise of the mass-circulation newspaper and the formation of a general readership’.¹²⁸ These phenomena are also central to the visual representation of the writer; the significance of writers’ positions in Russian society would be minimal if there was no one to read their works or to read about them or their portraits. The reception of portraits is closely connected to the development of the *feuilleton* as it was often through this journalistic form that *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions were presented to a general readership.¹²⁹

The development of publishing in Russia and the continual growth of an ‘imagined community’ of readers was one of the most fundamental elements of the wider social and cultural change Russia underwent in the middle of the nineteenth century. The readers of newly established journals such as *The Voice (Golos)* and *The Illustrated World (Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia)*¹³⁰ were in the main

¹²⁵ Ibid., p. 24.

¹²⁶ In St. Petersburg the number of daily newspapers rose from five in 1860 to seventeen in 1870 and then to twenty-two in 1880. Non-dailies increased from twenty-four to thirty and then to forty-three for the same years. The rise was mirrored in Moscow but on a smaller scale. Dailies went from two in 1860 to four in 1870 and then to seven in 1880. Figures given in McReynolds, *The News Under Russia’s Old Regime*, appendix A, p. 293.

¹²⁷ K. Dianina, ‘The *Feuilleton*: An Everyday Guide to Public Culture in the Age of the Great Reforms’, *Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 47, no.2, Summer 2003, pp. 187-210.

¹²⁸ Dianina, ‘The *Feuilleton*’, p. 188.

¹²⁹ All these areas and topics are examined in greater depth in part one, section iii.

¹³⁰ *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* (1869-1898) was established by the German family Hoppe and published weekly. It included articles on art, literature, travel, science, geography, national and international events. *Golos* was established in 1863 and Dianina examines it in her aforementioned article on the *feuilleton*. She quotes one contemporary commentator who claimed *Golos* was ‘the leading organ of public opinion’. The success of *Golos* is evident in its circulation which rose from 5,000 in 1865 to 23,000 in 1877. Dianina, ‘The *Feuilleton*’, p. 189.

members of a middle social group that emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century. The search for a public identity by those members of Russian society who can be described as belonging to the 'middle' social group - people who were neither peasants nor nobles but professionals, *raznochintsy* (people of various ranks)¹³¹ - has been subject to recent scholarly scrutiny. It is a complex subject as in nineteenth-century Russia the search for public identity was interlinked with the exploration of national identity. The formation of the *Peredvizhniki* needs to be seen not only within the context of the development of Russian art and the establishment of a national school of painting, but also within the context of the establishment of professional and civic societies, charitable bodies and associations which contributed to the formation of a civil society in late imperial Russia.¹³²

The creation of the *Peredvizhniki* is evidence of artists' reconsideration of their professional and social status, but the success of their exhibitions and the attention these exhibitions attracted from the newly established newspapers and journals is evidence of a growing population of urban, literate Russians who had some disposable income but who were not aristocrats, nor peasants, but members of a 'middle' social group and who were the instigators and operators of a developing urban society. In her analysis of social identity in imperial Russia¹³³ E.K. Wirtschafter not only emphasises the role of self-definition in the formation of a middle social group¹³⁴ she also highlights the importance of economic and industrial development in Russia which was largely brought about by middle social groups and from which some members, such as P.M. Tret'iakov and his fellow Moscow merchants and industrialists greatly

¹³¹ On the term *raznochintsy* see C. Becker, 'Raznochintsy: The Development of the Word and of the Concept', *American Slavic and East European Review*, vol. XVIII, 1959, pp. 63-74.

¹³² The role of voluntary associations and civil societies is examined by A. Lindenmeyr, 'The Rise of Voluntary Associations during the Great Reforms', in *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*, pp. 264-279 and by J. Bradley, 'Voluntary Associations, Civic Culture, and *Obshchestvennost'* in Moscow', in E.W. Clowes, S.D. Kassow & J.L. West (eds.), *Between Tsar and People. Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, Princeton, 1991, pp. 131-148. For a brief discussion of the term *obshchestvennost'* see C. Kelly & V. Volkov, '*Obshchestvennost'*, *Sobornost'*: Collective Identities', in C. Kelly & D. Shepherd (eds.), *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940*, Oxford, 1998, pp. 26-27. As well as the *Peredvizhniki* other art-centred associations were formed in the 1860s-1880s including the Moscow Society for Art Lovers in 1860. For an overview of the growth of art associations in Russia see, D.Ia Severiukhin & O.L. Leikind, *Zolotoi vek, khudozhestvennykh ob'edinenii v Rossii i SSSR (1820-1932)*, St. Petersburg, 1992.

¹³³ E.K. Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia*, De Kalb, Illinois, 1997.

¹³⁴ Wirtschafter, *Social Identity in Imperial Russia*, p. 63.

benefited. The existence of what Wirtschafter terms a 'commercial-industrial elite',¹³⁵ in the second half of the nineteenth century, in turn provided an alternative source of patronage for Russian artists. The purchase of art by Tret'iakov and others like him, was not only philanthropic, it was also a visible means for this social group to define their public identity and social position. Apart from a 'commercial elite' an economically prosperous middle social group that inhabited the major provincial cities of the Russian Empire was also necessary for the survival and success of the *Peredivizhniki*. Members of the Society not only relied on the orders and purchases of major patrons such as Tret'iakov, they also profited from the visitors to their exhibitions through ticket sales, catalogue sales and of course, the sale of works of art directly to the public.

The second half of the nineteenth century, beginning with the Great Reforms of the 1860s was not only the era 'when Russia learned to read' it was also the era when a significant part of urban Russia had their photograph taken, went to an exhibition, subscribed to journals, shopped for pleasure, joined voluntary associations and charities, and even took up cycling!¹³⁶ As Kassow, West and Clowes clearly state in their introduction to their landmark study on public identity in late imperial Russia 'cultural life in pre-Revolutionary Russia played a vital role in developing and elaborating new public identities.'¹³⁷ As a middle social group emerged in nineteenth-century Russia, they cemented their position within Russian society not only by defining themselves through cultural activities, but also by involving themselves in social and political reforms. The most overt example of this was the failed attempt of Russian intellectuals to 'go to the people' in the 1870s. Russian artists attempted to raise social awareness of the problems in Russian society through the creation and exhibition of socially critical genre painting.

Portraiture is not the most effective genre in painting to respond to the demand of the alleviation of suffering in society. It can highlight the suffering of an individual, who then could be seen as a representative of society, but a genre

¹³⁵ Ibid., p. 71.

¹³⁶ L. McReynolds and C. Popkin discuss the 'bicycling craze' that gripped late imperial Russian society in 'The Objective Eye and the Common Good', in *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940*, pp. 57-105, p. 78.

picture, such as Perov's *Tea Drinking in Mytishchi* (*Chaepitie v Mytishchakh*) (1862) which shows a fat priest ignoring the appeals of a crippled war veteran, fulfils the task more explicitly and with more drama. Genre pictures, along with landscapes and history paintings, can also represent a 'national' school of painting with greater force than a portrait can; they can feature recognizable national subjects and themes, such as the Russian Orthodox priest or the distinct Russian steppe.

The demand for a 'Russian' school of painting was most strongly made by the critic Stasov, which perhaps explains why he concentrated on genre paintings rather than portraiture in his exhibition reviews. Stasov, who in the West is better known as a commentator on nineteenth-century Russian classical music,¹³⁸ was the most outspoken Russian art critic of the 1860s to 1890s. He believed Russian art, like Russian music, would only become truly successful and respected internationally, if it embraced national themes and subjects. Its failure to do so and the lack of 'Russianness' in the Russian art entries to the 1862 World Exhibition in London explained Russia's failure at the event.

Here are the just deserts of our lack of originality and copying, here is just punishment for our art's slavishness in the face of foreign art and foreign schools. The first time Russian works were shown alongside the works of other nationalities, no one found anything remarkable about the works of which we are so proud. "What is there to interest us", foreigners asked [...] "You should develop your own school, without imitation and repetition, then it would be different" [...] And, of course, they are right.¹³⁹

Official recognition of works of art that depicted Russian subjects and, in addition, had a social message was already underway. An identifiable turning point was V.G. Perov winning an Academy gold medal for his painting *The Village Sermon* in 1861. The art establishment rewarded the achievement of this painting and did not ignore it because of its critical presentation of rural Russian clergy and congregation. The 1860s are a period in which genre painting flourished and the foundations were laid for the formation of the *Peredvizhniki*

¹³⁷ S.D. Kassow, J.L. West & E.W. Clowes, 'Introduction: The Problem of the Middle in Late Imperial Russian Society', in *Between Tsar and People*, p. 11.

¹³⁸ See Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, pp. 177-178 and Iu. Olkhovskii, *Vladimir Stasov and Russian National Culture*, Ann Arbor, 1983.

¹³⁹ V.V. Stasov, 'Posle Vsemirnoi vystavki 1862 g.', *Izbrannoe: zhivopis', skul'ptura grafika v dvukh tomakh*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1950-51, vol. II, pp. 235-272, p. 236.

in 1870. But where did this leave portraiture, particularly representations of Russian writers? As will be discussed further on, if the 1860s saw the decline of painted portraits, then it witnessed an ascent of printed ones. For a moment perhaps, it seemed that the painted portrait was dead, that photography was *the* means for the representation of a person. During the 1850s a number of Russian photographers had established themselves in the two Russian capitals and began to photograph well known figures, writers included. The most famous photographers were Sergei L'vovich Levitskii (1819-1898) and the German Karl August Bergner (working in Moscow 1850s-1860s). Some of the photographs taken of writers in the 1850s have a direct link to the *Peredvizhniki* in that Tret'iakov commissioned artists such as Perov and Kramskoi to create portraits based upon these already existing images. For example, Bergner's photograph of the writer Sergei Timofeevich Aksakov (1791-1859) taken in the last years of the writer's life, became the basis for nearly all subsequent portraits of the writer. It was reproduced as a lithograph in A.E. Miunster's *Portrait Gallery of Notable Russians*¹⁴⁰ (Fig. 8) and was used both by Perov and Kramskoi in order to produce posthumous portraits of Aksakov. Indeed, the majority of the writers who sat for *Peredvizhniki* artists had usually already been photographed prior to the 1870s. One particularly arresting image was a group portrait photograph of contributors to the journal *Sovremennik*.¹⁴¹ (Fig. 9) The photograph was taken on 15 February 1856 and featured the writers I.A. Goncharov, I.S. Turgenev, A.V. Druzhinin, A.N. Ostrovskii, L.N. Tolstoi and D.V. Grigorovich. Levitskii took individual photographs of all the writers as well, but it is the group portrait that has had the greater longevity, reproduced in books and volumes concerned with nineteenth-century literature and the intelligentsia, capturing as it does a meeting of some of Russia's greatest literary figures, either at the height of their fame, such as Ostrovskii or at the start of it, such as Tolstoi; 'the quintessential image of Russian artistic life'.¹⁴² Druzhinin described the group sitting in his diary 'Going over the portraits of the others and myself, laughing, chatting and killing

¹⁴⁰ A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereiia russkikh deiatelei*, 2 vols. vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869. This publication is examined in part one, section iv.

¹⁴¹ *Sovremennik* (1847-1866) was a 'thick' literary journal, first established by A.S. Pushkin in 1836. It mostly featured works of literature but sometimes included pieces on art and reviews of exhibitions. Gray, *Russian Genre Painting*, pp. 57-59.

¹⁴² D. Elliot, *Photography in Russia 1840-1940*, London, 1992, p. 34.

time.’¹⁴³ However, the group photograph provides no evidence of such a merry meeting, quite the opposite it would appear. Perhaps Levitskii and his subjects wished to present a collection of serious intellectuals; the result is Goncharov and Grigorovich appear somewhat bored, whilst Turgenev and Ostrovskii stare out into the distance; Ostrovskii in particular seems mesmerized by something off camera. Tolstoi presents us with the most thought-provoking portrait. Unlike the other writers his body is turned outwards, whereas the rest face into one another. He is also wearing a military uniform and with his crossed arms and a face fixed in something of a scowl, he presents an air of defiance and general reluctance to be present. In 1857 Levitskii’s photographs were engraved and reproduced by Vasilii Timm (1820-1895) in his journal *Russian Arts Bulletin* (*Russkii khudozhestvennyi listok*) (1851-62). All the writers who appeared in the photograph (except for Druzhinin, who died in 1867) were later to be portrayed at least once by *Peredvizhniki* artists, usually at the behest of Tret’iakov.

Stasov dismissed photography as a means of producing an effective and true portrait; it may have made more portraits available to more people but the actual activity of photography he believed was ‘accessible to each and every person’¹⁴⁴ and therefore this devalued its worth. During the course of the second half of the nineteenth century, Stasov’s opinion would be severely challenged by photographers who produced insightful and engaging portraits of Russian public figures, writers included, but the photographic portrait would not take precedence over the painted one. From 1859-1865 the aforementioned Levitskii lived in Paris and whilst there, photographed the writer Aleksandr Ivanovich Herzen (1812-1870) who was also his cousin. The portrait (Fig. 10) taken in 1865 shows a tired looking Herzen, his head wearily resting on his arm, which in turn rests on a pile of papers. The way Levitskii has lit the studio throws both light and shade onto Herzen’s face, emphasising the despondent expression of the writer. The surroundings of the studio, the sumptuous fringed chair and tablecloth and the attire of Herzen, seem at odds with the writer’s demeanour.¹⁴⁵ Some years later, another artist portrayed Herzen, this time the painter Ge, who

¹⁴³ Druzhinin, quoted in G.A. Mirolubova & T.A. Petrova, *Peterburgskii al'bom. Fotografii iz kollektsii Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha*, Moscow, 2002, p. 177.

¹⁴⁴ V.V. Stasov, ‘Fotografiia i graviura’, 1856, quoted in Elliot, *Photography in Russia*, p. 34.

apparently had been sent a copy of the Levitskii portrait from Herzen himself, and then subsequently ‘adapted Herzen’s pose and demeanour’ for his representation of Christ in his painting, *The Last Supper (Tainaia vecheria)* (1863).¹⁴⁶ As will be discussed in subsequent sections, the artists Kramskoi and Perov executed the majority of realist portraits of writers that concern this thesis.

However, the first portrait of a writer that can be identified as part of this realist portrait tradition was executed by Ge in 1867. Although Ge’s portraiture is less well known than his works based on historical or biblical subject matter, his 1867 portrait of Herzen (Fig. 11) can be seen as something of a landmark, or turning point, in nineteenth-century Russian portraiture. *Portrait of Aleksandr Herzen* is one of the earliest examples of realist portraiture¹⁴⁷ and so consequently, constitutes a major development in the visual presentation of Russian writers. The portrait is an intriguing work as it has both a great deal in common with later *Peredvizhniki* portraits of writers and a number of fundamental differences with the majority of them. Firstly, it was not painted in Russia and it was not commissioned by Tret’iakov, although he later acquired it in 1878.¹⁴⁸ Secondly, as it was created prior to the formation of the *Peredvizhniki*, it was not included in any of the travelling exhibitions, nor was it shown at any Academy exhibition. Indeed, if Tret’iakov had not purchased it, it might have never been publicly exhibited during Ge’s lifetime. In this respect, it is very much a private portrait, an artist’s personal tribute to a figure he held in great regard and whom he had longed to meet. ‘I dreamed of going to London, in order to see him, in order to know him, in order to paint his portrait for myself’.¹⁴⁹ The portrait was not painted in London however, but in Florence, and

¹⁴⁵ This photograph was used as the basis for an engraving by V.V. Mate in 1903. See E. Petrova (ed.), *The State Russian Museum. St. Petersburg: A Portrait of the City and its Citizens. A Celebration of the Tercentenary of St. Petersburg*, St. Petersburg, 2003, p. 331.

¹⁴⁶ Elliot, *Photography in Russia*, p. 40.

¹⁴⁷ Another characterization of it is as ‘Portrait-biography’ by Turchin. Turchin makes use of Herzen’s comment on the ‘Rembrandtish’ mood of the portrait, ‘the first master of which (portrait-biography) was Rembrandt’ and continues that ‘Portrait-biography’ was only able to appear in a period of blossoming realism, *Portrety russkikh pisatelei*, p. 50.

¹⁴⁸ Ge made a number of versions of this portrait. An 1878 copy is in the Kiev Museum of Russian Art; an undated copy in the State Hermitage Museum and another undated copy is in the Dneproterovskii State Museum of Art. The artist also made a copy in 1870 which is now at an unknown location. S.N. Gol’dshstein (ed.), *Portretnaia zhivopis’ peredvizhnikov*, Moscow, 1972, p. 35.

¹⁴⁹ V.V. Stasov, *N.N. Ge, ego zhizn’, proizvedeniia i perepiska*, Moscow, 1904, p. 159. Although it does seem sometimes that the relationship is over dramatised in Soviet art scholarship. For example, in A. Vereshchagina’s article ‘Portret-Kontrabanda’, *Neva*, no. 7, 1956, p. 188, the

painted over the course of five sittings.¹⁵⁰ At the beginning of February 1867, Herzen wrote to his friend and collaborator Nikolai Ogarev (1813-1877), that he was to have his portrait painted by ‘the famous painter Ge [...] for posterity’.¹⁵¹ Unlike some writers, Herzen’s letters frequently included mention of Ge’s picture, or, *chef d’oeuvre* as the writer liked to describe it. Although it appears that Herzen had little input into the portrait’s composition or pictorial development, he was incredibly flattered by Ge’s request and had nothing but admiration for the painter and his work. ‘The portrait of your Uncle, is so large,¹⁵² Ge does an excellent job’ he wrote to his niece.¹⁵³ Other observations include: ‘The portrait comes on Rembrandtish’¹⁵⁴, ‘The portrait has been finished. It is a first class *chef d’oeuvre*’¹⁵⁵ Indeed the whole Herzen family seems to have been interested in the work. In a letter to Ogarev, Herzen comments that the painting’s near completion ‘finds everyone in a state of excitement’¹⁵⁶ and Herzen’s daughter, Natalia, decided to undertake her own amateur portrait of her father, working alongside Ge.¹⁵⁷ Herzen’s letters give an indication of the personal nature of the creative process of the portrait, the involvement of friends and family in its production. Yet it does not seem to have affected Ge’s representation of Herzen.

The portrait was painted in the last years of Herzen’s life; an intellectual force of the 1840s; now shown as an old, intellectually rejected, man of the ‘60s. It is to Ge’s credit that the representation of his hero¹⁵⁸ is not conventional or idealized; he does not try to re-present the defiant and dapper Herzen of the 1840s, an image seen in photographs and prints. Instead, Ge represents this

author claims ‘Even in youth the artist [Ge] gave his bride the most precious gift of Herzen’s article *As regards one drama*.’

¹⁵⁰ Vereshchagina, ‘Portret-Kontrabanda’, p. 188.

¹⁵¹ A.I. Herzen-N.P. Ogarev, 7 February 1867. A.I. Herzen, *Sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh*, 30 vols. vol. XXIX, book 1, Moscow, 1963, p. 29.

¹⁵² The portrait measures 78.8 x 62.6 cm and is not particularly large compared with other *Peredvizhniki* portraits, in fact it is smaller than the majority of them.

¹⁵³ A.I. Herzen-L. Herzen, 14 February 1867, *Sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh*, vol. XXIX, book 1, p. 36.

¹⁵⁴ Herzen-Ogarev, 13 February 1867, *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁵⁵ Herzen-Ogarev, 8 March 1867, *Ibid.*, p. 56.

¹⁵⁶ Herzen-Ogarev, 28 February 1867, *Ibid.*, p. 50.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 554.

¹⁵⁸ Although the selection of Ge’s opinions about Herzen by Soviet scholars has to be questioned, it does seem that Herzen was a huge influence on Ge, as Tolstoi was later to be. ‘Herzen was the most dear, favourite writer of my wife and me...we owe him our development. His ideas, his striving electrified us’. Stasov, *N.N. Ge*, p. 159.

Russian writer in a manner that emphasises intellectual power, in spite of personal adversity and which also rejects flattery of physical likeness, present in images of writers and intellectuals in the 1820s-1840s. An early portrait of Herzen taken by A.L. Vitberg in 1836, during the writer's exile in Vyatka for his membership of a 'philosophical circle', depicts him in this idealized manner – it is not a representation of Herzen many would recognise, or consider 'like' him. The conflicting way in which painted portraits and printed portraits – photographs, engravings, lithographs – present their subjects is in an important issue and one discussed later on. It is enough comment here, that the more traditional form of representation, the painted portrait, frequently presents us with a more challenging representation of the subject than does the photograph or print. Ge's ability to create a portrait of great psychological depth was always emphasised by Soviet art critics,¹⁵⁹ and it was never equalled in his later portraits of writers. With Herzen, Ge succeeded to represent and manipulate his subject's physical features in a way that stressed Herzen's intellectual capacity, and his identity as a writer, alongside his own personal suffering. Ge's portrait can be seen as a model 'writer-portrait iconography' for those portraits that were to follow.¹⁶⁰ Portrait painters of the 1860s to 1880s were facilitated in their task of presenting their male subjects as serious individuals by the serious nature of men's fashion at this time. The fashion for beards, which was a European wide phenomenon, drew attention away from the mouth area to the eyes and forehead. Ge places Herzen against a plain dark background, without the 'setting' Levitskii's portrait had. As we will see, most writer-portraits of the 1870s placed their subjects against plain and usually dark backgrounds. With the darkness of the background surrounding Herzen's upper facial area and the darkness of the beard to the lower facial area, it is the cranium and the eyes that are highlighted. As Stasov observed, in contrast to the unkempt 'hair with streaks of grey, swept back, without a parting', Ge emphasised the subject's 'high forehead [...] lively

¹⁵⁹ In general, Soviet art historians judged *Portrait of Aleksandr Herzen* to be full of contradictions but, at the same time, whole. 'The image of the writer is psychologically many-sided and simultaneously whole – its strength is rooted in the enclosure of its feeling.' N.Iu. Zogaref, *Nikolai Ge*, Moscow, 1974, p. 27. 'The artist created a complex image, simultaneously whole and contradictory'. Vereshchagina, 'Portret-Kontrabanda', p. 188.

¹⁶⁰ See Brilliant's comments on the photographic representation of American statesman Daniel Webster. '...here also is an elaborate portrait iconography: the large cranium, indicative of the great mind within; the powerful and proper stance of a mid-nineteenth-century gentleman'. R. Brilliant, *Portraiture*, London, 1997, p. 56.

clever eyes, energetically looking out from behind wrinkled eyelids, a broad nose, Russian, as he himself called it, with two sharp lines on either side'.¹⁶¹ It is not for this British author to say whether a 'broad nose' is a particularly 'Russian' physical characteristic, yet if it is it is the only identifiably 'Russian' element of the portrait. Herzen was painted in Europe, where he had been a political exile for years, he is presented in European dress and his wearing of a beard may have implied seriousness and intelligence in the 1860s, but this was in a European-wide context. Ge's portrait of Herzen, understandably, does not have explicit visual Russian reference points, and this is again, a feature common to many portraits of Russian writers from the 1870s.

Critics including Benois and Stasov have declared Ge's representation of Herzen to be one of the most outstanding Russian portraits of the nineteenth century.¹⁶² However, the work is not only an example of Ge's artistic talent, but can also be seen as symbolising the complex nature of mid-nineteenth-century Russian national identity. The relationship between Ge and Herzen also reflects the intellectual and cultural developments underway in nineteenth-century Russia, particularly in reference to the appreciation of art and the role of the artist in society. Although both sitter and artist were Russian, their relationship was conducted in Europe and the painting was executed in Florence; both men were exiles from Russia, but in very different senses. Herzen of course, had been an exile of necessity since 1846.¹⁶³ Ge's work was not restricted or censored, but, even though the 'Revolt of the fourteen' had taken place four years earlier, the painter still found Russia too artistically stifling an environment; in Italy there was 'expanse, freedom'.¹⁶⁴ However Ge's period in Italy (1857-1870) was not an entirely successful time and saw the artist in 'an extremely difficult and dramatic search for his own identity'.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, unlike artists such as Perov, Ge did not draw inspiration from everyday scenes of ordinary Russian life. His vehicle for communicating suffering was through historical figures and

¹⁶¹ Stasov, *N.N. Ge*, p. 160.

¹⁶² '... for example, in the famous portrait of Herzen, Gay attains the splendour and firmness of Bryullov's brush...without betraying his essential character of inward nobility'. A. Benois, *The Russian School of Painting*, London, 1916, p. 105. 'V.V. Stasov numbers it as one of the best portraits of all the Russian School in general'. Vereshchagina, 'Portret-Kontrabanda', p. 188.

¹⁶³ After the 1848 European revolutions Herzen had been ordered by the Russian Government to return, this he failed to do and therefore was sentenced and exiled officially in 1851.

¹⁶⁴ Stasov, *N.N. Ge*, p. 159.

¹⁶⁵ Sarabianov, *Russian Art from Neoclassicism to the Avant-Garde*, p. 126.

scenes, most notably Jesus and the Crucifixion. It seems he considered Herzen, and in later years Tolstoi, as living historical figures and *Portrait of Aleksandr Herzen* expresses the personal suffering of the writer at a time when he was 'restlessly travelling about Europe'¹⁶⁶ and being overlooked or ignored by the Russian radicals of the 1860s. Vereshchagina rightly observes that once one carefully examines the portrait one 'feels a hidden concern and fatigue'.¹⁶⁷ In 1867, Russian portrait painting witnessed a revival in fortunes and a portrait of a writer heralded a new era for realist painting in Russia. If the 1860s had seen the triumph of genre painting in Russia, the 1870s would be the decade of the portrait.

¹⁶⁶ J. Edie, J. Scanlan & M. Zeldin (eds.), *Russian Philosophy*, vol. I, p. 325.

¹⁶⁷ Vereshchagina, 'Portret-kontrabanda', p. 188.

Part one

The *Peredvizhniki* and the Portrait of the Writer

Mr Tret'iakov is one of the most dread enemies of Petersburg because, at the very first opportunity, he buys up and carries off to Moscow, to his outstanding gallery of Russian art, everything of note that appears here in Petersburg; but at the same time he is one of those people whose name will not be forgotten in the history of our art, because he values and loves it as hardly anyone does, and in a short period he has compiled, from his own vast means, a gallery of new Russian painting and sculpture the likes of which has never been seen anywhere before.

V.V. Stasov.¹⁶⁸

Section i. Collaboration and Creation, the Writer takes shape

The end of the 1860s and beginning of the 1870s witnessed the establishment of an unprecedented collection of portraits in Russia and one that was to have an unequalled effect on the visual representation of Russian writers. In the analysis of the visual representation of Russian writers the contribution made by the Moscow merchant and art patron Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov cannot be overestimated. Quite simply, without his vision and money, a large proportion of portraits of Russian writers produced in the 1870s and 1880s would not exist. Tret'iakov's patronage of *Peredvizhniki* artists was unrivalled and in reference to portraits of writers, the activities of the *Peredvizhniki* have to be viewed in conjunction with the aims of Tret'iakov. These subsequent pages examine the ways in which the combined efforts of the *Peredvizhniki* and their patron firstly created a number of key portraits of writers in the 1870s and 1880s and subsequently, provided the opportunity for these portraits to be viewed by both a Russian and European public.

The development of a Russian school of painting in the 1860s that included genre scenes, landscapes and portraits executed in a Realist manner necessitated a new means of effectively exhibiting these works to a Russian audience beyond the confines of the Academy's own exhibitions. In comparison to the rather utopian but ineffective *Artel'*, the *Peredvizhniki* were a business

¹⁶⁸ V.V. Stasov, 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka 1871 goda', *St. Petersburg Gazette (Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti)*, nos. 333 & 338, 1871. All extracts from 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka 1871 goda' used in this thesis are taken from the Russian Visual Arts website: <http://hri.shef.ac.uk/rva/texts/stasov/stas09/stas09.html>. Trans. by C. Adlam.

orientated, structured organization that maintained inventories and accounts, and which undertook the dual role demanded by its members – to promote contemporary Russian art throughout Russia and in doing so, increase the number of potential patrons for Russian art. In the Society's 1869 statute, the *Peredvizhniki* outlined their mission in a few lines: 'to provide the inhabitants of the provinces with the opportunity to follow the progress of Russian art. By such means the Society, in the attempt to increase the circle of art lovers, will open up new roads for the sale of works of art'.¹⁶⁹ The 'opportunity' referred to here are the travelling exhibitions that were, as their name suggests, the main activity of the *Peredvizhniki*. As well as St. Petersburg and Moscow, travelling exhibitions visited a number of the major provincial cities of the Russian Empire, including Kiev, Khar'kov and Riga. Although Russians may have first seen *Peredvizhniki* works in a travelling exhibition, for many of the paintings their permanent home was not to be in the traditional centre for the arts, St. Petersburg, but the commercial capital, Moscow. As Stasov observed in his review of the first travelling exhibition, Petersburg lovers of Russian art had a 'dread enemy' in the form of the Muscovite businessman P.M. Tret'iakov. Tret'iakov began collecting art in 1854 when he purchased a number of Dutch old masters.¹⁷⁰ Although his brother Sergei (with whom he founded the Tret'iakov Gallery in Moscow) continued to collect Western European art, Pavel, after his initial purchase, decided to buy solely from Russian artists. Both business and ideological reasons motivated this decision. Tret'iakov never considered himself an art connoisseur, but by purchasing works produced by Russian artists he could guarantee authenticity and develop a patron-artist relationship that would have been impossible if he had ordered art from Western Europe. More

¹⁶⁹ 'Pis'mo gruppi moskovskikh khudozhnikov v S. Peterburgskuiu Artel' khudozhnikov, 23 November 1869', reproduced in V.V. Andreeva et al. (comps.), *Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok, 1869-1899, pis'ma, dokumenty*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1987. (Hereafter referred to as *Tpkhv*) vol. I, p. 51.

¹⁷⁰ Tret'iakov purchased his first works of art in this year although he did not decide to actively dedicate himself to collecting art until 1856, inspired by Fedor Ivanovich Prianishnikov (1793-1867) whose collection contained a number of outstanding works of Russian art. Throughout his life Tret'iakov wished to obtain the Prianishnikov collection but after his death it was incorporated into the Rumiantsev Museum. The Tret'iakov Gallery finally obtained the Prianishnikov paintings when the Russian art section of the Rumiantsev Museum was incorporated into the Tret'iakov Gallery in 1924. See I. Nenarokomova, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov i ego galereiia*, Moscow, 1998, p. 26 and N.M. Polunina, *Kto est' kto v kollektsonirovanii staroi rossii*, Moscow, 2003, pp. 306-308.

importantly, Tret'iakov held an ambition to bring Russian art to a wider Russian audience through the creation of a gallery in Moscow. He was primarily a patron of art, but his aims and achievements had far greater pedagogical and philanthropic implications than this title suggests. In a letter to his daughter, the Moscow merchant simply explained his ambition. 'My idea from my earliest years was to make money so that what had been accumulated by society should be returned to society, to the people (*narod*), in some sort of beneficial institutions.'¹⁷¹ Tret'iakov was not primarily concerned with the aesthetic qualities of art, but with how Russian art could be celebrated and in turn, celebrate and commemorate Russia – its people, culture, military forces, religion, history and landscape. A large proportion of the works on display in the State Tret'iakov Gallery today were purchased or commissioned by Tret'iakov between 1856 and 1898. In these years the patron amassed all types of Russian works of art - icons, landscapes, history paintings, genre scenes, sculpture - in order to create a comprehensive collection. Some of these works were already in existence, but with reference to portraiture, Tret'iakov not only bought portraits of Russian figures from the past, he actively commissioned portraits of Russian contemporaries he felt deserved visual posterity; amongst these celebrated individuals, writers had a particularly strong presence. However, before discussing particular portraits in detail it is worth considering the wider context and implications of Tret'iakov and his gallery, for his achievements as a patron of art also represent the success of a new social identity in Russia. The traditional patrons of art in Russia were the court and the aristocracy and Tret'iakov was the first patron outside of these groups to make a substantial impact on Russian culture.¹⁷² As John O. Norman discusses in his

¹⁷¹ Tret'iakov, trans. and quoted in J.O. Norman, 'Pavel Tret'iakov and Merchant Art Patronage, 1850-1900', in *Between Tsar and People*, pp. 93-107, p. 97.

¹⁷² Although there were of course exceptions to this, particularly amongst the most successful merchants of Moscow and St. Petersburg and Tret'iakov was not the only merchant to collect art at this time. Other merchant-professionals who were also art collectors included Vasilii Aleksandrovich Kokorev (1817-1889), Koz'ma Teret'evich Soldatenkov (1818-1901), Aleksei Ivanovich Khludov (1818-1882) and Dmitrii Petrovich Botkin (1829-1889). None of them, apart from Kokorev, shared Tret'iakov's passionate drive to create a collection of Russian art for Russia. Kokorev was in many ways Tret'iakov's predecessor, albeit less successful. Kokorev's collection included works by Levitskii, Borovikovskii, Venetsianov and Aivazovskii, as well as Western European works, and he opened it as a gallery in Moscow which was open daily for visitors - ticket price thirty kopecks. The gallery operated from 1862 to 1869 but due to Kokorev's financial difficulties it closed and the paintings were sold. Some works were purchased by the authorities for Imperial palaces; these later went to the Russian Museum, St.

essay on Tret'iakov, the traditional involvement of the Russian merchant class in the arts was to order a few family portraits, indeed, this particular social-professional group were often considered culturally and intellectually ignorant. Somewhat ironically, many *Peredvizhniki* painters whom Tret'iakov patronised sometimes chose to depict merchant families as boorish and provincial, such as in Perov's *Arrival of the Governess in the Merchant's House* (*Priезд guvernantki v kupecheskii dom*) (1866). Norman highlights the fact that Tret'iakov could not escape his professional and social heritage, he was belittled by members of the aristocracy and his dominance as a patron was often resented by artists, particularly those who themselves were from a higher social group than he was.¹⁷³ Yet Tret'iakov did more than demonstrate the growing power and influence of the middle social group in nineteenth-century Russia; he contributed to changes in the way in which Russian national identity was conceived and represented. Through his financial strength he was able to order and buy works of art, particularly portraits and landscapes, that presented Russians and Russia in a dramatically new, Realist manner. Arguably, this quiet, conservative Moscow merchant did as much for the development and promotion of Russian art as the critic Stasov or the painters Kramskoi or Repin.

Tret'iakov was driven by the ambition to create a collection of Russian art for Russia, in which portraits of notable Russian figures would have a prime

Petersburg. Tret'iakov bought seven pictures and one sculpture and the then unknown collector, D.P. Botkin bought the best of the Western European works. See Polunina, *Kto est' kto*, pp. 188-191 and R.P. Gray, 'Muscovite Patrons of European Painting: the Collections of Vasily Kokorev, Dmitry Botkin and Sergei Tretyakov', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 10/2, 1998, pp. 189-198. The merchant Soldatenkov also collected Russian art, which eventually went to the Rumiantsev Museum, housed in the 'Soldatenkov Halls'. Khludov concentrated on manuscripts and icons, most of which after his death went to the Nikol'skii monastery in Moscow. Polunina, *Kto est' kto*, pp. 438-441. D.P. Botkin was distantly related to Tret'iakov, his nephew Sergei Sergeevich Botkin (also an avid collector) married Tret'iakov's daughter Aleksandra (who would later write an account of her father and his gallery). D.P. Botkin did not focus on Russian art but sculpture and applied arts of antiquity and the Renaissance, although he did purchase ninety-four works by A.A. Ivanov. Botkin's collection was a private one, housed in his Petersburg mansion, but apparently could be inspected by anyone who wished to do so. This remained the case after his death until 1918 when the collection was 'nationalized' with many items going to the Russian Museum and the Hermitage. Polunina, *Kto est' kto*, pp. 53-57.

¹⁷³ Norman recounts an instance which demonstrates the social snobbery Tret'iakov encountered. In 1893 (a year after Tret'iakov had presented his gallery to Moscow) Grand Duke Sergei Aleksandrovich, director of the Moscow School of Art executive committee (of which Tret'iakov was a senior member), dismissed Tret'iakov's appeal against a newly appointed school inspector, N.A. Filosofov with the remark: 'I know Filosofov well- he's an educated man with great tact and I will not tolerate any unsubstantiated accusations against him'. Tret'iakov immediately resigned from the executive committee and the Moscow Society of Art. Norman, 'Pavel Tret'iakov and Merchant Art Patronage', pp. 98-99.

position. Tatiana Karpova has described the portraits in Tret'iakov's gallery 'as a museum within a museum – a national portrait gallery inside a national picture gallery'.¹⁷⁴ With the absence of any designated national portrait gallery in Russia, Tret'iakov's collection of portraits of writers, intellectuals, actors, musicians, artists, scientists and others, can be seen to serve a similar role in Russia as the National Portrait Gallery, London, does in Britain. However, two major differences between the two institutions existed. Unlike the National Portrait Gallery, Tret'iakov had no financial assistance from the Russian government, whereas the National Portrait Gallery was awarded two thousand pounds from Parliament for its establishment in 1856. Secondly, and more significantly, one of the original rules laid down by the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery was that *no portrait of a living sitter* was to be admitted; this was intended to be a gallery of historic portraits. Yet writers still had a central place in the National Portrait Gallery's collection and the first portrait to be listed in its inventory was the so-called 'Chandos' portrait of William Shakespeare donated by Lord Ellesmere.¹⁷⁵ Although the National Portrait Gallery concentrated on portraits of great figures from the British past, parallels can be drawn between Tret'iakov's portrait commissions and the activities of the British artist George Frederick Watts (1817-1904).¹⁷⁶ From the 1850s onwards, Watts decided to create his own 'Hall of Fame' – portraits of eminent British contemporaries, in which writers' portraits featured strongly, including portraits of Alfred Lord Tennyson, Robert Browning and Matthew Arnold. Due then, to the private enterprise of Tret'iakov's portrait commissions Russia, so often seen as 'backward' compared to the rest of Europe, particularly with reference to the arts, was operating on something of a parallel with Britain at this time. Unlike G.F. Watts, most Russian painters did not conceive of the idea of painting portraits of notable Russian figures themselves, although there are exceptions,

¹⁷⁴ Karpova, *Smysl litsa*, p. 59.

¹⁷⁵ P. Funnell, *Victorian Portraits in the National Portrait Gallery*, London, 1996, p. 2.

¹⁷⁶ There has been a recent resurgence of interest in G.F. Watts. On the 'Hall of Fame' see L. Perry, 'Nationalizing Watts: the *Hall of Fame* and the National Portrait Gallery', in C. Trodd & S. Brown (eds.), *Representations of G.F. Watts. Art Making in Victorian Culture*, Aldershot, 2004, pp. 121-133.

most notably N.N. Ge's portrait of Aleksandr Herzen (1867) – although Tret'iakov eventually purchased this work too.¹⁷⁷

The vigour Tret'iakov applied to collecting portraits is evident from a letter he wrote to Dostoevskii in 1872, asking the writer to sit for a portrait. 'I already have Karamzin, Zhukovskii, Lermontov, Lazhechnikov, Turgenev, Ostrovskii, Pisemskii and others. On order for the future are Herzen, Shchedrin, Nekrasov, Kol'tsov, Belinskii and others. Allow me to have your portrait too'.¹⁷⁸ The letter clearly shows that Tret'iakov not only commissioned portraits of living writers, but also of deceased ones. In examining the correspondence between Tret'iakov and artists, the number of commissions he provided for the *Peredvizhniki* becomes apparent. At the end of March 1871 Kramskoi had just finished a posthumous portrait of the Ukrainian writer Taras Grigor'evich Shevchenko (1814-1861) for Tret'iakov at a fee of three hundred roubles. On hearing the news, Tret'iakov immediately wished 'to know, would it now be possible for you to make a start on portraits for me of Griboedov, Fonvizin, Kol'tsov.' Kramskoi replied with caution. 'Thank you for the new proposal to paint three portraits: Fon-Vizin, Griboedov and Kol'tsov; unfortunately, at the present time, i.e. right now, I am very busy and would not be able to do this work, if agreeable to you, until the autumn, because in the summer I think I will travel around Russia.'¹⁷⁹

Tret'iakov also attempted to purchase already existing portraits of writers both living and deceased, such as Fedor Antonovich Moller's portrait of Gogol (1840).¹⁸⁰ Although the purchase of portraits of deceased writers from their descendants could require negotiation, persuading living writers to sit for a portrait could pose much more of a challenge. Writers were not always eager for their likeness to be captured; it took Tret'iakov four years of negotiation before Tolstoi agreed to be painted and even then the writer drove a hard bargain; only agreeing to sit for a portrait if Kramskoi would execute another, free of charge,

¹⁷⁷ Tret'iakov acquired the work from Ge in 1878. See Ge-Tret'iakov, 12 March 1878, Z.M. Abramov (ed.), *Pis'ma khudozhnikov Pavlu Mikhailovichu Tret'iakovu 1870-1879*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 344-345.

¹⁷⁸ Tret'iakov-Dostoevskii, 31 March 1872, quoted in 'Novonaidennye i zabytye pis'ma Dostoevskogo', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 86, 1973, pp. 114-152, p. 120.

¹⁷⁹ Tret'iakov-Kramskoi, 24 March 1871 and Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 30 March 1871, S.N. Gol'dshtein (ed.), *Perepiska I.N. Kramskogo*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1953-54. (Hereafter referred to as *Perepiska Kramskogo*), vol. I, pp. 40-41.

¹⁸⁰ Tret'iakov acquired a version of this portrait in 1870.

for Tolstoi to keep. Indeed, it was the business concerns of the ‘portrait transaction’ which filled a large proportion of Tret’iakov’s correspondence with artists: how long a painting will take, how much will it cost, how much will it cost to send, could the artist receive an advance. These are the issues that are repeated time and again in the letters between patron and painter and sometimes a third party too, a ‘go-between’. In the above case of Tolstoi, the poet Afanasii Afanas’evich Fet (1820-1892) made appeals to the novelist on Tret’iakov’s behalf.¹⁸¹ When Tret’iakov tried to persuade Kramskoi to paint a portrait of the writer Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov (1812-1891),¹⁸² Tret’iakov’s friend, the painter Aleksandr Antonovich Ritsstsoni (1836-1902), described Kramskoi’s demands for a fee of five hundred roubles. ‘To me this seems expensive, and I told him that Perov had taken three hundred and fifty roubles for the Pisemskii, and then he answered, that may be so, but that I won’t take any less than five hundred— or I refuse the work. That’s my last word on the subject.’¹⁸³ The ‘Pisemskii’ referred to here is a portrait of the writer Aleksei Feofilaktovich Pisemskii (1820-1888)¹⁸⁴ (Fig. 12) painted by Perov in 1869¹⁸⁵ and one of the first ‘writer-portrait’ commissions Tret’iakov placed.

¹⁸¹ In 1869, when Tret’iakov first made enquiries about the possibility of Tolstoi sitting for a portrait, A.A. Fet acted as intermediary between the two parties. In response to Fet’s first proposition of the idea Tolstoi replied, ‘About Tret’iakov I don’t know, I don’t want to sit for anyone’. Tolstoi-Fet, 10 May 1869. In recounting the news to Tret’iakov, Fet expressed the situation a little more optimistically. ‘I wrote to Tolstoi about your proposition. About it he replied doubtfully and indecisively, and so I asked him to say definitely yes or no – at this present time I have not received an answer’. Fet-Tret’iakov, 28 June 1869. Both quotes taken from V.P. Lapshin, ‘Biografiia portretov L.N. Tolstogo raboty I.N. Kramskogo, raskazannaia v pismakh, otzyvakh i vospominaniiakh’, *Panorama iskusstv* 3, Moscow, 1980, pp. 244-283 and pp. 244-45.

¹⁸² Goncharov’s first novel *A Common Story* (*Obyknovennaia istoriia*) was published in 1847 but he is best known for the novel *Oblomov*, (1859). His third novel, *The Precipice* (*Obryv*) (1869) met with mixed responses from the critics and other writers. Goncharov then retired somewhat from public and literary life but his portrait was often included in illustrated journals and portrait-biography albums. For an overview of portraits and photographs of Goncharov see A.D. Alekseev (comp.), *I.A. Goncharov v portretakh, illiustratsiakh, dokumentakh*, Leningrad, 1960. There are a number of works on Goncharov and his novels, particularly *Oblomov*. See for example M. Ehre, *Oblomov and his creator: the life and art of Ivan Goncharov*, Princeton, 1973.

¹⁸³ Ritsstsoni-Tret’iakov, quoted in A.P. Botkina, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret’iakov v zhizni i iskusstve*, Moscow, 1993, p. 98. See also Kramskoi-Tret’iakov 26 September 1869 and Tret’iakov-Kramskoi 29 September 1869 in which they further discuss the possibility of the commission and wrangle over a fee of three hundred and fifty or five hundred roubles. *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, pp. 33-34. The Goncharov portrait was the subject of the first letters between patron and artist in a relationship that would last until Kramskoi’s death in 1887.

¹⁸⁴ Pisemskii’s reputation has diminished since the nineteenth century but during the 1860s he was considered one of Russia’s leading writers; a rival to Turgenev and Goncharov. Pisemskii portrayed the darker side of middle class life in Russia – marriages for money, corrupt bureaucracy and the constant struggle to establish oneself financially and socially; all themes

Perov and Kramskoi were Tret'iakov's two favourite artists where portrait commissions were concerned. Although Kramskoi painted some portraits for the merchant in the early 1870s, it was Perov whom Tret'iakov mainly turned to - perhaps as much for his affordability, as his artistic ability. As well as Pisemskii, Perov painted the following writers for Tret'iakov: Aleksandr Nikolaevich Ostrovskii¹⁸⁶ (1871) (Fig. 13); Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevskii (1872) (Fig. 14); Apollon Nikolaevich Maikov¹⁸⁷ (1872) (Fig. 15) and Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev¹⁸⁸ (1872) (Fig. 16). In the early 1870s Perov also painted portraits of the historian Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin (1872) (Fig. 17) and the lexicographer Vladimir Ivanovich Dal' (1872) (Fig. 18) for Tret'iakov. In 1870 he made another version of the Pisemskii portrait¹⁸⁹ and in 1872 he copied an 1837 portrait of M.Iu. Lermontov by Petr Efimovich Zabolotskii (1804-1866) for Tret'iakov¹⁹⁰ as well as executing a portrait of S.T. Aksakov from a photograph. Apparently, in 1872, Perov also made some kind of portrait of Tolstoi, although the only reference to this is in a letter from the doctor Vasili

explored in his greatest literary success, the novel *A Thousand Souls* (*Tysiacha dush*) (1858). Although by 'the 1870s Pisemsky had lost his prominent position in the world of Russian letters', (V. Terras, *A History of Russian Literature*, New Haven, 1991, p. 345) his portrait was often included in portrait-biography albums and the most successful representation of him, a portrait by I.E. Repin, was only produced in the penultimate year of the writer's life. See C.A. Moser, *Pisemsky: A Provincial Realist*, Cambridge, Mass., 1969.

¹⁸⁵ Please refer to the appendix at the end of the thesis for full details of this portrait and all those *Peredvizhniki* portraits that follow.

¹⁸⁶ A.N. Ostrovskii (1823-1886) grew up in the commercial district of Moscow and his plays brought the life and language of the Russian merchant to the Russian stage. He wrote over 50 plays that were a mixture of comedy and social realism but amongst his best known are *It's all in the Family* (*Svoi liudi – cochemsia!*) (1847) *The Storm* (*Groza*) (1860) and *Forest* (*Les*) (1871). See M.L. Hoover, *Alexander Ostrovsky*, Boston, 1981; K.S. Rahman, *Ostrovsky: Reality and Illusion*, Birmingham, 1999.

¹⁸⁷ A.N. Maikov (1821-1897), like Pisemskii, is no longer one of the most famous Russian writers of the nineteenth century, but during his lifetime the poet and close friend of Dostoevskii was painted and photographed on a number of occasions.

¹⁸⁸ Turgenev was of Russian noble stock and although he spent most of his adult life in Europe, was one of Russia's most popular authors. His most celebrated works include *A Sportsman's Sketches* (*Zapiski okhotnika*) (1852) and *Fathers and Children* (*Ottsy i deti*) (1862). Turgenev had a tremendous interest in the Fine Arts and as well as being photographed and painted numerous times was friends with a number of Russian painters whom he often met in his capacity as Secretary of the Society of Russian Artists in Paris. There are numerous biographies and studies on Turgenev in Russian and English. See, for example, A. Iaromlinsky, *Turgenev: The Man, His Art and His Age*, New York, 1977; D. Magarshack, *Turgenev: A Life*, London, 1954.

¹⁸⁹ This portrait is in the collection of the Institute of Russian Literature, Academy of Sciences (*Pushkinskii dom*), St. Petersburg.

¹⁹⁰ Both Lermontov portraits are now in the TG but the original portrait had been in a private collection when Tret'iakov placed the order with Perov.

Vladimirovich Bessonov (?-1887)¹⁹¹ to Stasov.¹⁹² In addition, Tret'iakov also asked if the artist might manage a portrait of the writer Dmitrii Vasil'evich Grigorovich (1822-1899),¹⁹³ a request Perov understandably turned down (it was later fulfilled by Kramskoi in 1876). In the early 1870s Perov also depicted 'ordinary' individuals such as the merchant Ivan Stepanovich Kamynin (1872) (Fig. 19). The portraits of Ostrovskii, Dostoevskii, Maikov, and Turgenev were all exhibited at either the first, second or third *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions, and the critical reception they received in the press will be discussed further on.

After 1874 Perov abandoned portrait painting to concentrate on pictures of biblical and historic subjects and he left the *Peredvizhniki* in 1878. His mantle as Russia's leading portraitist was passed to Kramskoi, with whom Tret'iakov's first letters from 1869 concerned the Goncharov portrait, finally painted by the artist in 1874 (Fig. 22) and exhibited at the fourth *Peredvizhniki* exhibition. Kramskoi painted the following writers for Tret'iakov: Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoi (1873)¹⁹⁴ (Fig. 20); Dmitrii Vasil'evich Grigorovich (1876) (Fig. 23); Nikolai Alekseevich Nekrasov (1877)¹⁹⁵ (Fig. 24); N.A. Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs (1878) (Fig. 25) and Mikhail Evgrafovich Saltykov-Shchedrin (1879)¹⁹⁶ (Fig. 26). In common with Perov, Kramskoi painted posthumous portraits for Tret'iakov based on photographs of the aforementioned Shevchenko (1871) and S.T. Aksakov (1878) and based on earlier portraits, of Aleksandr

¹⁹¹ Bessonov was the subject of a portrait by Perov in 1869 that received first prize from the Moscow Society of Art Lovers and was exhibited at the Imperial Academy of Arts in 1869.

¹⁹² The letter is in the archive of N.P. Sobko, National Library of Russia, St. Petersburg. Reference in 'Spisok portretnykh rabot V.G. Perova', N.N. Morgunova (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii portreta. Vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, p. 411.

¹⁹³ Grigorovich, like Turgenev, was a writer who had a great interest in the Fine Arts. He was secretary of the Society for the Encouragement of Art (1864-1884) and helped organize the Russian entry to the Fine Art Section, World Exhibition, Paris 1878.

¹⁹⁴ For further discussion of this work see part one, section ii.

¹⁹⁵ N.A. Nekrasov (1821-1877) made outstanding contributions to both Russian poetry and journalism. As a poet his main subjects were the Russian people (*narod*) but unlike Tolstoi or Ostrovskii his own 'Russianness' was never evident in his appearance, rather Nekrasov was known for his fashionable dress and bon vivant lifestyle. For a selection of images of Nekrasov and illustrations to his works see E.F. Gollerbakh (comp.), *N.A. Nekrasov v portretakh i illiustratsiakh*, Leningrad, 1938.

¹⁹⁶ Like Nekrasov, Saltykov-Shchedrin made his mark both in journalism and literature (his review of a *Peredvizhniki* exhibition is later discussed.) His novels such as *The History of a Town (Istoriia odnogo goroda)* (1869-70) and *The Golovlev Family (Gospoda Golovlevy)* (1875-80) were biting satires of provincial Russian life. For a selection of images of Saltykov-Shchedrin and illustrations to his works see E.F. Gollerbakh (comp.), *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v portretakh i illiustratsiakh*, Leningrad, 1939 and V.N. Baskakov (comp.), *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v portretakh, illiustratsiakh, dokumentakh*, Leningrad, 1968.

Sergeevich Griboedov (1873).¹⁹⁷ Kramskoi also occasionally undertook portraits of writers that were not commissions from Tret'iakov. At the time of painting Tolstoi in 1873 he simultaneously executed another, similar portrait (Fig. 21) for the writer and his wife. In 1883 he painted Maikov, in a work that he encouraged Tret'iakov to purchase, but which the merchant declined. In 1881 Kramskoi made a deathbed portrait of Dostoevskii (Fig. 38).

The other *Peredvizhniki* artist who depicted a number of writers in the early 1870s was Ge, who painted Turgenev (1871) (Fig. 27); Nekrasov (1872) (Fig. 28) and Saltykov-Shchedrin (1872) (Fig. 29). These portraits were executed whilst Ge resided in St. Petersburg from 1869 to 1875 and immersed himself in the literary life of the city. Ge was an individual who sought intellectual and spiritual guidance throughout his life; he was later to become a disciple of Tolstoi and painted the writer at work in 1884 (Fig. 30). These 1870 portraits, particularly of Turgenev and Nekrasov, are often passed over by scholars and have generally been judged to be 'unsuccessful'.¹⁹⁸ They appear not to be as engaging or insightful as Kramskoi's portraits of the same subjects, but this makes them all the more intriguing as they were not the result of commissions from Tret'iakov, but were men Ge personally knew and admired. Indeed, if Perov took a business-like approach to painting, accepting orders as they were placed, Ge was quite the opposite and did not accept commissions. This raises the issue of motivation and the effect it does or does not have on the creation of a portrait. If the initial motivation for the creation of a portrait came from neither of the two main parties in the portrait transaction - subject and artist - but a third party, does this affect the execution and artistic standard of the works? If the subject is indifferent or reluctant to be painted and if the artist regards the commission as primarily a business transaction, does this have a detrimental effect on the work? These questions remain in the arena of opinion and are impossible to answer definitively. Yet, it would seem that the success of a portrait is not based on the personal relationship between subject and sitter. Moreover, the fact that neither artist nor subject instigated the Tret'iakov commissions, does not, perhaps, detract from their worth, but rather, highlights

¹⁹⁷ The Shevchenko, Aksakov and Griboedov portraits are all in the TG.

¹⁹⁸ T.N. Gorina, 'Nikolai Nikolaevich Ge', in N.N. Morgunova (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, p. 46.

their uniqueness as portraits; the value of which lies not primarily in the nature of their creation, but in the nature of their reception. These portraits were never intended to be received in a private or intimate space, nor were they created for a particular audience, but were always intended to be on display to the general Russian public (and subsequently, in some cases, a European public). Therefore, when analysing the representation of personal, professional and national identity in these portraits it would be expected that the representation of the latter two would predominate; Tret'iakov's aim was to publicly display portraits of great *Russian writers*. However, the identity of 'writer' is not like that of military leader, where achievement and success can be indicated through the inclusion of medals and honours or placing the subject in a victorious battlefield setting. In depicting a 'writer' the artist must focus on characteristics of the subject that could also be seen as part of his personal identity, to show the psychological and intellectual condition and thought process of the sitter. Indeed, when personal and professional identities are not in harmony with one another, or rather contradict one another, the portrait is often unsuccessful and is either ignored or criticised. Although this thesis places greater emphasis on the reception the writer-portraits of the 1870s and 1880s received, first of all we will examine the construction and composition of some of these portraits and where possible, the opinions of the painters and subjects on the process of creation.

The portrait of Pisemskii by Perov (Fig. 12) is not one of his better known works. It no longer hangs on the walls of the Tret'iakov Gallery, but in the Ivanov Museum of Art.¹⁹⁹ It is often ignored in discussions on Perov's works; scholars instead focus on a portrait of the doctor Bessonov, also painted in 1869, or begin their examination of Perov's portraits of cultural figures with his portrait of Ostrovskii or that of the composer Anton Grigor'evich Rubinstein (1870). With reference to images of Pisemskii, Perov's portrait is overshadowed by Repin's later portrait of the writer made in 1880 (Fig. 31) which was also a Tret'iakov commission. Yet Perov's portrait is worth considering for a moment, for like Ge's of Herzen, it is the starting point of the *Peredvizhniki* portraits of the 1870s. Although the creative processes of Ge, Kramskoi and Perov differed - e.g. Ge would not accept commissions, Perov painted a large number of works

¹⁹⁹ The portrait was transferred from the TG to the Ivanov Museum of Art in 1930.

in quick succession, Kramskoi often had many works simultaneously in progress²⁰⁰ - when one examines their portraits produced in the 1870s they place their subjects within the portraits in a similar fashion.

In the creation of a portrait, or any work of art for that matter, one of the most basic factors to consider is the size of the work. In the case of a portrait, should it increase, decrease or mirror exactly the physical dimensions of the subject? The Pisemskii portrait, at 97 x 70 cm is a little smaller than Perov's portraits of the early 1870s where it would seem the artist worked on set size canvases roughly 103.5 x 80 cm in dimension and Ge used similarly sized canvases. Kramskoi's portraits varied more in size, but on the whole tended to be slightly smaller. However, the sizes of the portraits produced by all three artists neither enlarged nor reduced the subject but allowed the artist to produce an accurate reproduction of the subject. It did mean that subjects would be shown only from their waist up; legs are sometimes seen in portraits of writers but only if the subject is shown sitting down. The role of the Herzen portrait has been discussed as a point of departure for the portraits of the 1870s. With reference to the depiction of the body, limbs and face there is one important area on which the Herzen portrait differs to those mentioned above; Herzen's hands are not visible. This may seem a trivial matter, but when the subject's profession is directly connected to the physical activity of writing then the depiction of a hand or hands takes on a far greater significance.

A Professional Body

The visual representation of a writer's profession is most easily attained through the depiction of the subject either in the process of writing or with the inclusion of an accessory that makes reference to it. Yet the *Peredvizhniki* rarely used this device, with some exceptions. The most notable of these is Kramskoi's portrait *N.A. Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs* (Fig. 25) which shows the writer lying in his sick bed, but still hard at work. However, this composition seems to

²⁰⁰ Tret'iakov expressed his amazement at the workload the painter agreed to take on. 'You can manage all this – I am at a loss? You have in hand, besides the tsarina [Kramskoi painted two portraits of Empress Maria Fedorovna in 1877] – Nekrasov, Saltykov, Kol'tsov, Samarin, you still have to begin to paint Aksakov, Tolstoi (A.K.) and Rubinstein, if at all possible...' Tret'iakov-Kramskoi, 21 March 1877, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 186.

present a message of strength and courage in the face of death, as well as explicitly show the viewer that the subject is a writer. The fact is the writers in *Peredvizhniki* portraits were well known enough that it was not necessary to include an accessory or activity that indicated their profession. Indeed, when Ge in 1884 produced a portrait of Tolstoi (Fig. 30) that did show the author hard at work, the painter was rebuffed for doing so. In assessing the portrait, one reviewer made a point relevant not only to Tolstoi, but to the representation of famous subjects in general:

Ge...presents the famous novelist writing at a table loaded with books and paper. The head is lowered, the eyes not visible, and along with them the whole face is almost out of view. [...] it is impossible to paint a major portrait thus. Any portrait, but especially a portrait of a famous person, is painted neither just for acquaintances nor for one's contemporaries, but for posterity, who will, of course, be curious to see the face and physiognomy of people, who have become renowned celebrities of the age.²⁰¹

This critic at least, had no desire to see a portrait that captured a moment of creativity, for him a good likeness was what mattered. The portraits of Turgenev and Maikov by Perov may not show the authors writing but they do make reference to their subjects' profession by the placement of books in their hands. The inclusion of manuscripts or books in a portrait of a writer is a common painterly device; we saw it in the earlier discussed portrait of Derzhavin (Fig. 3) and V.A. Tropinin placed a pile of papers under Pushkin's right arm in his 1827 portrait of the poet (Fig. 94). However, it is unusual to come across the use of such accessories in Perov's 1870s portraits, whose subjects' hands are usually placed somehow in contact with their person and are treated with great confidence by the artist.²⁰² The portraits of Maikov and Turgenev are less successful than others and this can partly be explained by the treatment of the writers' hands; they seem too 'posed' and the use of books brings nothing to the pictures. When Perov appears to do little with his subjects' hands is when they are most effective. In the portrait of Dostoevskii, the writer's hands are in the

²⁰¹ Anon., 'XII peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin', *Russian Thought (Russkaia mysl')*, May 1884, p. 83.

²⁰² 'Perov never overlooked the opportunity to depict hands: they occupy a significant place in all his portraits'. Fedorov-Davydov et al. (eds.), *V.G. Perov: Prilozheniia, dokumenty, pis'ma i rasskazy, katalog proizvedenii, bibliografiia*, p. 64.

forefront of the picture, clasped tightly around his knees; they are a point of light at the bottom of the picture, as is Dostoevskii's head at the top. Although Dostoevskii's body seems frail, weighed down by his coat, his hands appear strong and their firm clasp implies determination and they offer a strong physical anchor in the picture; an anchor for Dostoevskii's mind, lost deep in thought. Karpova raises the point that the depiction of the hands can indicate internal strength or weakness. She argues that Ge represents the weariness of Nekrasov's and Saltykov-Shchedrin's souls through presenting their hands as weakly downcast.²⁰³ The role and implications of hands in these portraits is not solely the concern of present day scholars. The 1879 portrait of Saltykov-Shchedrin by Kramskoi caused the painter two years of indecision and letters between Tret'iakov, who originally ordered the work in January 1877, and the artist are full of questions by the former as to when it will be finished and assertions from the latter that it is almost complete.²⁰⁴ In one of the first letters to mention the portrait, Tret'iakov, who was extremely pleased about the commission asked Kramskoi '...what size to you intend to make this portrait? It seems to me that his hands should be painted.'²⁰⁵ By 29 March Kramskoi reported that the portrait was finished but indicates that there had been some problems in its execution, taking into consideration Tret'iakov's above wish for hands. 'In the portrait of Saltykov there is a major change in the figure, and it seems for the better: the table has quite vanished and both hands are present.'²⁰⁶ This was not the end to the matter of course, as the final portrait does include a table. In fact, Kramskoi was to deliberate over the portrait for another two years, in which time Tret'iakov continually enquired after it.

With reference to Perov's portrait of Ostrovskii, the positioning of the hands in an assertive manner contributes to the general confidence Ostrovskii appears to exude. In this work, the hands again work as a balance in the portrait, forming a triangle with the writer's face. In contrast to Dostoevskii, Ostrovskii's body fills out almost the entirety of the canvas and his firmly placed

²⁰³ Karpova, *Smysl litsa*, p. 158.

²⁰⁴ 'The portrait of Saltykov is almost finished, one or two more sittings and it will be complete.' Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, late February/early March 1877, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 185. 'With reference to my portraits I must again bother you: most of all the portrait of Saltykov worries me'. Tret'iakov-Kramskoi, 19 March 1878, *Ibid.*, p. 224.

²⁰⁵ Tret'iakov-Kramskoi, 25 January 1877, *Ibid.*, p. 181.

²⁰⁶ Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 29 March 1877, *Ibid.*, p. 186.

left hand offers his bulk a support. Perov's portrait of Ostrovskii represents the writer as a strong, confident figure, a point emphasised by the size and placing of his body. Far from appearing deep in contemplation like Dostoevskii, or slightly worried like Pisemskii, whose eyes nervously dart to the side, Ostrovskii stares defiantly at the viewer and Perov positions him as leaning forward, almost into the viewer, as opposed to Ge's portraits of Nekrasov and Saltykov in which the subjects lean back in their chairs, creating a further distance between subject and viewer. Ostrovskii's stance and demeanour are similar to those of another Perov subject, not a writer, but the merchant Kamynin (Fig. 19). Kamynin, like Ostrovskii, stares straight ahead, his hands firmly clasped in his lap. Although the merchant is an elderly man, Perov does not present him as vulnerable, but rather, again like Ostrovskii, as a man who is resilient and strong, hard even. By 1871 Ostrovskii was a well established playwright whose Realist works brought the life and language of the Russian merchant class and urban dweller to the stage.²⁰⁷ In his manner and dress, a *tulupchik* - a Russian sheepskin coat or robe - he could certainly be mistaken for a Moscow merchant. One critic called Ostrovskii's plays 'as authentically Russian as a tavern with foul-mouthed drunken talk and songs in the background.'²⁰⁸ Ostrovskii, along with Pisemskii, was known as a heavy drinker and Perov presents us with a man who looks as if he would feel at ease in a tavern, foul or otherwise. As will be seen, Perov created a unique representation of Ostrovskii in this portrait, as the writer was portrayed in prints and photographs as smartly dressed. Indeed, in the spectrum of portraits of Russian writers Ostrovskii was one of the few, besides Tolstoi, to be depicted in particularly 'Russian dress'. At a time when the applied and decorative arts in Russia were undergoing a revival of 'Russian Style' in patterns, motifs and designs²⁰⁹ the clothes of the Russian urban gentleman and lady were in accordance with those of Paris and London. There were those Russian merchants who still wore the traditional dress of their particular

²⁰⁷ See G. Thurston, *The Popular Theatre Movement in Russia, 1862-1919*, Evanston, Illinois, 1998, for a discussion of Ostrovskii's plays.

²⁰⁸ Quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 64.

²⁰⁹ The second half of the nineteenth century witnessed a growing trend in Russian applied and decorative arts for patterns and designs that revived those of medieval Russia and native folk art. See E. Kirichenko, *Russian Design and the Fine Arts 1750-1917*, New York, 1991.

professional group,²¹⁰ but for the middle or upper class Russian man the style and cut of their suit was in general the same as for other European males.²¹¹

If Russian painters hoped to represent their writers as serious, intellectual figures, they were greatly assisted in this task by contemporary fashions in dress and male grooming which for most of the second half of the nineteenth century were serious and plain. In the 1820s and 1830s male costume could be said to have rivalled female in terms of cut, colour and the emphasis it placed on the male body, with knee breeches and frock coats that accentuated the waist. Male fashion in the second half of the nineteenth century, up until the 1890s, was almost the complete antithesis to the frivolity of earlier decades. Clothes were sombre and sensible both in colour and cut. Items where colour had previously been found – in neckties and waistcoats – were neglected in the 1870s and 1880s and only experienced a revival in the 1890s. Neckwear changed in shape too, and slim ties and narrow bow ties replaced the large bow ties of the 1820s and 1830s.²¹² This can be seen in Ge's portrait of Nekrasov and Perov's of Maikov. In Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii the writer wears a long neck tie, which does provide a flash of colour in the portrait. *The Tailor and Cutter* described the condition of European male dress in 1871: 'Gentlemen dress as quietly as it is possible to do and there are no remarkable extremes in dress.'²¹³ Although this statement was made in a British trade publication it can be applied to the dress of men in Russia, as much as in Britain, and in the majority of the *Peredvizhniki* portraits of writers there are no remarkable extremes in dress either. The writers are nearly always presented in jackets, shirts and some form of neckwear, with individual variations. For example, Ge's portrait of Saltykov-Shchedrin depicts

²¹⁰ The second half of the nineteenth century saw Russian merchants gradually alter their dress and customs and evolve from Moscow merchants into European businessmen. '...changes in dress helped Moscow merchants to rethink their social identity'. C. Ruane, 'Caftan to Business Suit: The Semiotics of Russian Merchant Dress', in J.L. West & I.A. Petrov (eds.), *Merchant Moscow. Images of Russia's Vanished Bourgeoisie*, Princeton, 1998, pp. 53-60, p. 59.

²¹¹ It has proved difficult to find any specific information on male dress in Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century. L.V. Efimova et al. (eds.), *Kostium v Rossii XV-nachala XX veka: iz sobraniia Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo muzeia*, Moscow, 2000 is typical of histories of Russian costume in that it focuses on female fashion and when it does examine male dress, it is either military uniforms or fashions prior to 1860.

²¹² A.A. White, 'Sartorial Facts and Fashions of the Early 1890's', in A. Saunders (ed.), *High Victorian Costume 1860-1890. Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of the Costume Society March 1968*, London, 1969, pp. 16-20.

²¹³ *The Tailor and Cutter*, 1871, quoted in Penelope Bird, *Nineteenth Century Fashion*, London, 1992, p. 104.

the writer in a black velvet indoor jacket and Turgenev in Perov's portrait is similarly attired. Occasionally, the ornamentation of a watch chain or cufflinks can be glimpsed; accessories most urban affluent gentlemen would wear. The tones of the suits are black, charcoal, grey, and brown. One practical reason for the darkening of the male suit at this time was the increasing pressure of urban life, clothes had to stand up to the demands of a dirty city and in terms of shape suits became looser and less restrictive, offering the wearer greater freedom of movement. However, the wearing of dark colours also implies that the person in question is a serious individual. John Harvey has made a study of the role of black in clothing and argues that it has two strong underlining messages, both of which have relevance to the representation of writers. Firstly, that black as a colour in dress originates from clerical dress, 'when it was associated with a kind of spiritual grieving: with a spirituality that placed humanity in an infinite abandonedness and depth of need'. Secondly, that black awards its wearer with respect and presents them as an authority figure – 'the man in black is the agent of a census power'.²¹⁴ The darkness of the dress we see in the portraits of writers not only presents them as figures worthy of respect, but also as men of intellectual and spiritual depth. The creation of a writer's portrait that afforded its subject respect, reverence even, was one of the main tasks of the *Peredvizhniki* painters commissioned by Tret'iakov. Perov and Kramskoi had the challenge of presenting both the personality of the writer and also somehow embodying in that figure the magnitude of their professional achievement. With reference to Dostoevskii's observation, that a 'person does not always look like himself' the task of Perov and Kramskoi was perhaps *not* to represent a subject simply when they looked like themselves, but when they looked like a writer. Three portraits by Kramskoi illustrate the difficulty there is in striking a balance between the representation of personal identity and professional in a portrait, or suppressing one for the sake of the other.

In terms of writing about their paintings and their thoughts on art in general, Kramskoi was probably the most voluble member of the *Peredvizhniki*. In a letter to Tret'iakov he discussed his concerns about the Saltykov-Shchedrin portrait:

²¹⁴ J. Harvey, *Men in Black*, London, 1995, p. 257.

As far as M.E. Saltykov is concerned one is going to have to be happy with it. It has come out a good likeness and the expression is his (his wife is very satisfied) but the painting, if one can express oneself without causing offence, has come out a bit murky (*murugaia*)²¹⁵ and intentionally so because I envisaged that he ought to be painted in deep shadow, and that's how I painted it but I see now I ought not to have tried to have been so clever. In a word, in this portrait you are not making any particular discovery in the sense of art, but as it's wrong for a shopkeeper to run down his goods to the customer, I'll say it's not entirely bad, only a bit dark and even so it's a good likeness.²¹⁶

As has been noted, Kramskoi was to make further alterations to this portrait but in terms of painting, the palette he used was fairly dark, with Saltykov's hands and the dome of his head highlighted; the most significant parts of a writer's physiognomy. That the subject's skill and achievement lie in their intellectual and creative capabilities was indicated by the painter focusing the viewers' attention on the subject's head, particularly the forehead and dome of the skull. Ge's portrait of Saltykov-Shchedrin is also quite 'murky' with the writer clothed in black and his hands and face, particularly forehead, the illuminated points of the picture. This was a painterly device that was employed throughout European portraiture and photography at this time; G.F. Watts used the same techniques in his portraits of writers - head and shoulders compositions with plain, dark backgrounds.

Kramskoi's letter shows that he felt a portrait had to be a good physical likeness (which in the case of Saltykov he believed he had achieved) but also there had to be something else, something which elevated the work from being a good likeness to a representation of the subject on a deeper level. Unfortunately, Kramskoi did not elaborate as to why he envisaged Saltykov in deep shadow. Was it a reflection of his personality - the writer admitted to 'my lack of sociability, my lack of charming manners'²¹⁷ - or did the painter want to express something more than Saltykov's personality, to make reference to the darkness of the writer's humour and his biting criticism of society and his contemporaries, so prevalent in both his journalism and literature?

²¹⁵ *Murugii*. A specialist term used for colour that describes something dark, 'reddish-brown or brownish-black'. S.I. Ozhegov, *Slovar' russkogo iazyka*, Moscow, 1981, p. 323.

²¹⁶ Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 29 March 1877, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 187.

²¹⁷ M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin-P.V. Annenkov, quoted in V.S. Pritchett, introductory essay to *The Golovlyov Family*, trans. R. Wilks, London, 1988, p. 16.

In some cases it seems that the artist did not intend to produce a portrait of a *writer* but a portrait of a person whose profession just happens to be that of writer. One example of this is I.N. Kramskoi's *Portrait of the Poet A.N. Maikov Fishing* (1883) (Fig. 32). This is an unusual work for a number of reasons and unlike the majority of Kramskoi's portraits was a mixed success. Firstly, the poet Maikov is depicted in a boat on a river amongst reeds and bulrushes. Apart from some portraits of Tolstoi, very few portraits of writers are given external settings, or settings at all. The absence of background or accessories is an important feature in writers' portraits as the viewers' focus is concentrated on the figure of the person, particularly the head and face. Rarely, do we find portraits of writers in 'settings'; even in Kramskoi's portrait of Tolstoi, which he painted at the writer's estate Iasnaia Poliana, there is no indication of the location. In the *Peredvizhniki* portraits of the early 1870s the main role of background was to provide a contrast for the writers' head and shoulders. The sittings for the majority of portraits usually took place in the writers' homes, rather than the artists' studios, but there is not indication of this and these windowless interiors also result in these portraits having a timeless quality; it is impossible to say what time of year it is or whether it is day or night. If a photograph is meant to capture a 'moment' then these portraits try to dispense with time altogether and present the intellect and psyche of their subjects as something that is eternal, which to some extent it is, existing in their writing.²¹⁸ Therefore Kramskoi's portrait, which provides a definite setting, breaks with the traditional method of portraying writers. Only I.E. Repin's portraits of Tolstoi, also executed in the 1880s, depicted their subject in identifiable surroundings such as a forest or a study.

Secondly, Maikov is shown engaged in a physical activity, rather than a creative or intellectual one. Thirdly, we are presented with his whole body; portraits of writers are usually presented in a head and shoulders format only.

²¹⁸ This device of representation was not limited to Russian writers. G.F. Watts, painting at exactly the same time as the *Peredvizhniki* used the same techniques in his portraits of figures from the worlds of arts and letters: head and shoulders compositions with plain, dark backgrounds. In particular, his portraits of Edward Coley Burne-Jones (1870) and Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1870-1871) are extreme examples of portraiture without a discernible setting. In the portraits of Burne-Jones and Rossetti the bodies of the subjects are completely ignored and attention is fixed solely on the face and head. See V. Franklin Gould, *G.F. Watts. The Last Great Victorian*, New Haven, 2004, pp. 98-100.

Finally, there is something in the pose and poise of Maikov that could be seen as rather undignified and almost characteristic of an entertaining genre scene. The writer balances precariously in the small boat; will this bespectacled gentleman go tumbling in, we wonder, and end up amongst the reeds? The question of the dignity of the portrait, was an issue at the time of its creation and generated a rather heated correspondence between Tret'iakov and Kramskoi that dragged on long after the picture had been completed and displayed at the twelfth *Peredvizhniki* exhibition in 1884. The correspondence between patron and artist underlies the particularly 'public' nature of these writer portraits commissioned and bought by Tret'iakov, and the significance both patron and artist placed on the reception of them by critics and public.

Maikov was a writer whose portrait Tret'iakov never seemed to desire in the way he did those of Dostoevskii, Tolstoi or Turgenev. V.G Perov painted the writer in 1872 when Tret'iakov sent him to St. Petersburg principally to paint Maikov's friend Dostoevskii. Indeed, as is discussed in section ii, it appears it was only due to Dostoevskii's request, that Maikov's portrait was also painted by Perov; Tret'iakov so much wanted a portrait of Dostoevskii that he readily agreed in order to keep the novelist happy. Perov's portrait received some favourable comments when it was exhibited at the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition but it did not attract the same attention as Dostoevskii's portrait and lacks its psychological depth. Therefore, when in 1884 Kramskoi presented his portrait of Maikov as a possible purchase for the Tret'iakov Gallery (which had now been open to the Moscow public for some years) perhaps he should not have been so surprised by Tret'iakov's refusal to purchase it. Tret'iakov explained his reasons: 'As regards Maikov, on serious reflection, I will not take it; I've come to the conclusion, that, having a fairly good portrait of him [the one by Perov] a second one would be superfluous.' Tret'iakov then rather cuttingly added, 'Maikov is not such a celebrity, that I need to have two portraits of him.'²¹⁹ However, there was more to Tret'iakov's refusal than simply not wanting another portrait of Maikov, or so Kramskoi suspected. When the work was presented some contemporaries of the poet thought Kramskoi had created it

²¹⁹ Tret'iakov-Kramskoi, 10 April 1884, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 304.

in jest or ironically; that it visually played on Maikov's own love of fishing and his poem *Fishing (Rybnaia lovlia)*. In his reply to Tret'iakov, Kramskoi clearly voiced these fears:

That you already have his portrait and that he's not a poet, whom you need to have more than one portrait of - seems to me an unconvincing reason. More likely, I fear that you were influenced by rumour, by claims that I painted with irony. This rumour has reached me and, I confess, very much distressed me, since I never had any bad intentions when making this portrait.²²⁰

The matter of this portrait was dropped by the patron, but not the artist, who in a postscript to a letter dated almost two years later, once again demanded a more detailed answer from Tret'iakov:

I am sorry that you have evaded completely from answering apropos my portrait of A.N. Maikov. Truly, this is curious. Do you consider the portrait an unworthy joke on my part? Or do you simply believe that two portraits are too many to have of such a poet? Or that the canvas (*kholsi*) is very poor? It is simply interesting to me personally. Of course, you do not have to explain yourself to satisfy my curiosity [...] of course, it is a pity if you think it (the picture) very bad, - but I can prove that all other suspicions are quite groundless.²²¹

Tret'iakov once again reiterated his point that one portrait was quite enough to have of Maikov, both for himself and more importantly for visitors to the gallery:

I am satisfied with this [the Perov portrait] and in general it is enough to have one portrait of persons I want, since many (of the public) find, that now there are too many portraits in the collection, and besides which there are many I still do not have: I do not have a large portrait of you, of Repin, Makovskii, V. Vereshchagin, Prianishnikov, Iaroshenko, Katkov (no one wants to paint him) and someone else— who I suddenly can't remember.²²²

²²⁰ Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 19 April 1884, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 305.

²²¹ Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 4 February 1886, *Ibid.*, p. 314.

²²² Tret'iakov-Kramskoi, 13 February 1886, *Ibid.* p. 315. Tret'iakov selected subjects who held a variety of philosophical, political and literary points of view. Tret'iakov's all encompassing approach to the selection of subjects sometimes brought him into conflict with artists; Il'ia Repin refused and chastised Tret'iakov for wishing to commission a portrait of the conservative publisher Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov (1818-1887). Repin felt the inclusion of Katkov's portrait into Tret'iakov's collection would somehow sully the other works: 'Is it possible that these people [meaning those with political views like Katkov] can hang alongside Tolstoi, Nekrasov, Dostoevskii, Shevchenko, Turgenev and others?! No, it must be stopped, for God's sake [...]'. Repin-Tret'iakov, 8 April 1881, in I.A. Brodskii (comp.), *I.E. Repin. Izbrannye pis'ma v dvukh tomakh 1867-1930*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1969, vol. I, p. 250.

Kramskoi's worries over the portrait seem both unnecessary and justified when reviews of the work started to appear. Most critics warmed to the picture, and the representation of the poet as 'fisherman' although many had concerns with the actual technical execution of the work.²²³

The fact that Kramskoi presented Maikov out of doors and involved in an activity such as fishing was unique²²⁴ as the *Peredvizhiniki* usually presented writers as men for whom intellectual and creative strength, rather than physical, was the significant factor. (The exception to this is of course Tolstoi). In many cases, physical vulnerability or a disregard for the importance of physical beauty or health offset the intellectual and creative abilities and power of a subject. For example, both Dostoevskii and Saltykov were beset by ill health, the former with epilepsy and the latter with chronic asthma, and neither Perov nor Kramskoi tried to downplay their subjects' conditions; neither writer looked well in his portrait and their poor health underlined the fact that these were men who achieved success through mental ability rather than physical. With reference to Saltykov, a later portrait executed in 1886 by Nikolai Aleksandrovich Iaroshenko (1846-1898) depicted the writer as even frailer, sitting in an armchair and wrapped in a shawl or blanket²²⁵ (Fig. 33). Saltykov was also photographed at around the same time and in the same poor state of health by his assistant, Longin Fedorovich Panteleev (1840-1919). Panteleev, referred to the Iaroshenko portrait in his memoirs, stating on one occasion that when Saltykov was upset 'he somewhat reminded me of the portrait [...] painted by N.A. Iaroshenko.' He then rather bizarrely added, given he had just remarked

²²³ See section iii for further discussion of this picture.

²²⁴ Even Kramskoi's portraits of peasants rarely showed them engaged in work. Instead they were presented, for arguably the first time in the history of Russian painting, as individuals with personalities and psyches. Kramskoi, as with his portraits of writers, did not accessorize his peasants with backgrounds – there are no forests or fields or huts or cows or crops – the focus is on the personality of the peasant. The exception is the painting *The Contemplative (Sozertsatel')* (1876) but even this subject is not involved in a practical occupation of any sort, he is meditating. His spirituality is the focus of this work and the inclusion of the forest surround heightens the sense of this individual's solitary nature and withdrawal from society.

²²⁵ This portrait is rarely discussed by scholars as it seemed to disappear for a number of years. In 1934 P. Ettinger stated that although the portrait was known to exist, its present location was not known. 'Saltykov v izobrazitel'nom iskusstve', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol.13-14, 1934, pp. 555-568, p. 558. N.Z. Strugatskii repeated this point stating that after the portrait's appearance in the 1899 Iaroshenko exhibition it vanished. *Ukazatel' portretov M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina i illiustratsii k ego proizvedeniiam*, Leningrad, 1939, p. 9. A more recent source *Tpkhv* (1987) also lists the location of the work as 'unknown'. Vol. II, p. 636. However, the catalogue *Portretnaia zhivopis' peredvizhnikov*, (1972) states that work is the Literary-House Museum of N.A. Iaroshenko, Kislovodske and that the museum acquired the work in 1966.

on the likeness between original and portrait that 'the portrait, by the way, is far from successful.'²²⁶ Critics also had mixed opinions of Iaroshenko's portrait and one, given the severity of Saltykov's illness, was rather flippant about it.

Shchedrin, in domestic apparel – a sort of mixture between a travelling rug, a shawl and an overcoat – sits in a sort of dark corner, apparently suffering from indigestion, His face is almost without expression, it is despondent with suffering and it does not even have the photographic likeness from the original. We saw the photograph taken of Shchedrin last year, at the time of his illness; and this photograph is much superior to Mr Iaroshenko's painting.²²⁷

However, the most explicit visual example of a writer's poor physical health was of another journalist-writer, N.A. Nekrasov. The representation of Nekrasov has parallels with Saltykov as he too was both photographed and painted whilst suffering from a terminal illness. But whereas Iaroshenko's portrait is an honest depiction of an ill man in the last years of his life; it has no feel of triumph or achievement in the face of adversity about it, I.N. Kramskoi's *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs* shows the poet still composing verse and the painting demonstrates a conscious effort by Kramskoi to place Nekrasov's intellectual achievements above physical activity and condition. Although this painting is well known, the equivalent photograph (Fig. 34) is not, and I found only one contemporary reproduction of it in a memorial collection of articles about Nekrasov, the compilers of which noted in their preface:

Our book is accompanied by a portrait taken of the ill poet by the artist-photograph V.A. Karrik,²²⁸ he offered to provide it for our publication, and it has been drawn by a young talented artist, a student of the Imperial Academy of Arts I.T. Mikhailov.²²⁹

This photograph of Nekrasov shows the writer lying flat down and although a pen and paper are visible it would seem that the writer is overcome by illness and fatigue, a truthful representation one might believe of Nekrasov's state at

²²⁶ L.F. Pantleev, in V.V. Grigorenko et al. (eds.), *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v vospominaniakh sovremennikov v dvukh tomakh*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1975, vol. I, p. 320.

²²⁷ Stronnii zritel', 'Vystavki peredvizhnaiia i akademicheskaiia', *Art Journal (Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal)*, May 1887, pp. 327-330, p. 328.

²²⁸ William Carrick (1827-1878) was of Scottish birth but spent most of his life in St. Petersburg and worked as a professional photographer, best know for his images of Russian peasants. The Nekrasov portrait was one of his last photographs. F. Ashbee, 'The Carricks of St. Petersburg', in *The Caledonian Phalanx. Scots in Russia*, Edinburgh, 1987, pp. 91-105.

²²⁹ S. Glazenal et al. (comps.), 'Ot izdatelei', *Na pamiat' Nikolae Alekseeviche Nekrasove*, St. Petersburg, 1878.

this time. This representation of the poet is quite different to that presented in Kramskoi's work and this was due to the decision by Kramskoi to alter this picture after the death of the writer.

Initially, Kramskoi had been commissioned by Tret'iakov to paint a standard portrait of the writer in February 1877 (Fig. 24). This was a difficult task due to Nekrasov's poor state of health. Kramskoi reported to his patron that it was only possible to paint Nekrasov in sittings of ten to fifteen minutes in duration,²³⁰ but nevertheless the work was completed by April 1877. Whilst completing this portrait, Kramskoi wrote to Tret'iakov he had conceived of another of the poet, less traditional, which showed him lying in bed 'with some interesting details and accessories.'²³¹ Indeed, Kramskoi's second portrait of the poet is full of 'interesting details and accessories', unlike the Carrick photograph which is simple composition, focusing the viewer's attention on the poet's face, surrounded by white bedclothes. S.N. Gol'dshtein made a detailed study of this picture²³² and this thesis must turn to the evidence gathered by him, which demonstrates that Kramskoi constructed a specific context for his subject which heightened the representation of Nekrasov's professional identity at the expense of his personal one. Originally, Kramskoi had placed the figure of Nekrasov lying down, as in the Carrick photograph, but changed the position to sitting upright, still frail, but at least alert and deep in thought, contemplating the composition of his last verses. However, more significant was the alteration Kramskoi made to the poet's bedroom. In the picture are the accessories we might expect to find in a writer's room, on the bedside table sheets of papers and newspapers, a tea cup and bell but if the picture had been an accurate representation of the poet's room it would have also contained guns and other hunting memorabilia along with one of his faithful hunting hounds. Instead these have been removed and two portraits hang on the wall, one of Belinskii and one of Dobroliubov, much more fitting associations for the recently deceased writer to have. If Kramskoi provided Nekrasov with a more respectable setting it was not greatly appreciated when the work was exhibited, alongside the other

²³⁰ Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 16 February 1877, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 183.

²³¹ Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 29 March 1877, *Ibid.*, p. 187.

²³² S. Gol'dshtein, 'Iz istorii sozdaniia proizvedeniia I.N. Kramskogo "Nekrasov v period poslednikh pesen"', in E. Butorina (ed.), *Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia galereia: materialy i issledovaniia*, vol. II, Moscow, 1958, pp. 155-159.

portrait of the poet. Most reviews stated that the work deserved special attention,²³³ and only one referred to the accessories

N.A. Nekrasov is represented at the time of his terminal illness, half lying on an ottoman and reading through or perusing verses. The best aspect of this portrait, is the depiction of the face of the deceased poet which is not presented in a novel way, but as an accumulation on the other portrait of the writer in the exhibition [...] the only new aspect are the accessories, which acquaint the audience with the atmosphere of illness.²³⁴

If guns, dogs, and other such items had been included by Kramskoi these would have associated the writer with the outside world, with health and recovery. Instead Kramskoi placed the poet in the company of suitable and already deceased fellow men of letters; prophesying Nekrasov's own position as a writer whose portrait would be placed in remembrance on walls and pasted in memorial albums.

Nekrasov was not the only writer of his era to enjoy hunting. Another was I.S. Turgenev who in 1879 was depicted by N.D. Dmitriev-Orenburgskii (1837-1898) as the model Russian noble out hunting; gun in hand and ready to bag a brace of woodcock. This portrait, although it may initially seem far removed from representing the writer's profession, was of course ideal for those publishers wanting an eye-catching frontispiece for a collected volume of Turgenev's works that featured *A Sportsman's Sketches* (*Zapiski okhotnika*). Fig. 35 is an excellent engraved copy of the portrait from an edition of *Zapiski okhotnika* published in 1888.²³⁵ Turgenev was usually depicted in a more formal manner and the portrait-history of the writer deserves consideration for it demonstrates not only the significance of Tret'iakov's role in the creation of representations of writers, but also that successful portraits could not always be made to order.

Amongst the entire pantheon of Russian writers whose portraits were painted in the 1870s, it was I.S. Turgenev, a writer not even based in Russia at

²³³ For example 'Melochi o Peterburgskoi zhizni', *Illustrated Gazette (Illiustrirovannia gazeta)*, no. 13, 26 March 1878, p. 106 and N.T., 'Vystavka kartin "Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok"', *Petersburg Gazette (Peterburgskaia gazeta)*, no. 52, 15 March 1878, p. 2.

²³⁴ P.E., 'Shestaia peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 483, 8 April 1878, p. 243.

²³⁵ I.S. Turgenev, *Zapiski okhotnika*, St. Petersburg, 1888. Engraving by Ivan Petrovich Pozhalostin (1837-1909).

that time, who most regularly sat for his portrait; for Perov in 1871 and 1872, Ge in 1870-1871 and Repin in 1874 and 1878.²³⁶ The Perov and Repin portraits were commissions from Tret'iakov and it seems Tret'iakov was almost obsessed with obtaining a portrait of Turgenev that for him would be a true representation of the writer. This was an obsession that remained unfulfilled, for Tret'iakov was never completely satisfied with any portrait of Turgenev.²³⁷ Turgenev is one of the most interesting cases in the visual representation of Russian writers as the history of his portraits seem to show the constant failure to effectively combine the representation of personal and professional identity. Moreover, although Turgenev produced some of the most evocative literary representations of Russia, particularly the Russian countryside, in his works, his own 'Europeanness' deflected from the presentation of 'Russianness' in his portraits.

Tret'iakov's quest began in 1869 when he approached Karl Feodorovich Gun (Huns) (1830-1877) an early *Peredvizhniki* member (1872) who was living in Paris in 1869 (Turgenev was based in the French capital) and was asked by Tret'iakov to paint Turgenev, a request he declined.²³⁸ It was then Tret'iakov approached Perov, although according to Tret'iakov's biographer, Nenarokomova, Tret'iakov was reluctant to do this as he did not want too many portraits in his collection executed by one artist.²³⁹ However, Perov accepted the commission and in March 1871 began a portrait of Turgenev, an oval portrait the location of which has been unknown for a number of years.²⁴⁰ Due to Turgenev residing in France, it seems that when visiting Russia in the months of

²³⁶ Turgenev was also painted by Konstantin Egorovich Makovskii (1839-1915) in 1871 (location of work unknown) and Aleksei Alekseevich Kharlamov (1840-1925) in Paris in 1875 (RM). Kharlamov did exhibit with the *Peredvizhniki* in 1882, at the tenth exhibition. He exhibited two works, 'Head of a Girl' and 'Study of an Italian'. *Tpkhvk*, vol. I, p. 240. His 1875 portrait of Turgenev was only displayed at the 1876 Paris *Salon*. I have been unable to locate any reproductions of Repin's 1878 portrait and its present location is unknown. Repin also executed a portrait of Turgenev in 1883, following the writer's death in August of that year.

²³⁷ Tret'iakov also approached Kramskoi about the possibility of painting Turgenev but the artist refused. 'The portrait of Iv. Serg. Turgenev executed by Repin is quite unsatisfactory, now only you remain to do his portrait!' Tret'iakov-Kramskoi, 22 July 1874, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 96.

²³⁸ Botkina, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov*, p. 111.

²³⁹ Nenarokomova, *Pavel Tret'iakov*, p. 65.

²⁴⁰ The oval portrait, (59 x 46 cm) was for some time in the collection of the merchant G.I. Khludov and he is named as its owner in N.P. Sobko's *Illustrirovannyyi katalog posmertnoi vystavki proizvedenii V.G. Perova (1833-1882)*, St. Petersburg, 1883. Interestingly, although listed as a work by Perov, it was not shown in this exhibition. The portrait's location is now unknown and has been the case since at least since the 1960s. 'Primechaniia k glave II', N.N. Morgunova (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, p. 383.

February and March 1871, the writer was obliged to cram in sittings for both painters and photographers. At that time Perov, who during the period 1871-1872 seems to have been operating as a one-man portrait machine, was undertaking a portrait of Pisemskii, and Turgenev wrote to his fellow writer with the following communication for Tret'iakov, that he would agree to sit for Perov, but only 'if in the course of five days (no more) which I will spend in Moscow, he supposes he can paint my portrait.' He also added, perhaps hinting that he felt the Perov sitting was unnecessary, that 'here, in Petersburg, during the time of my stay, I was painted twice already – once by Ge and once by Makovskii, both different types of portraits, but it seems both completely successful, perhaps Tret'iakov will possibly acquire one of these.'²⁴¹ However, Tret'iakov did not acquire these works, though Ge's portrait was exhibited in the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition, listed as being the property of the artist. It is not one of Ge's best known portraits, perhaps because in the twentieth century it was exhibited not in the Tret'iakov Gallery or Russian Museum but in the Armenian National Gallery, Erevan.²⁴² Although Turgenev may have felt Ge's portrait was a success, one of Tret'iakov's earliest and closest artist friends, Aleksandr Antonovich Ritssoni did not recommend the work to him: 'I don't think it is very good, but I won't say anymore'²⁴³ which perhaps explains why Tret'iakov did not purchase it. As for the portrait of Turgenev executed by K.E. Makovskii, Nenarokomova states Tret'iakov 'did not like it' and the work is something of a mystery. Turgenev makes little reference to it in his letters, merely saying it is being painted simultaneously by Ge and Makovskii, and that the latter 'who only asked me for one sitting and who has made something quite remarkable as a painting'. In the 1960s this portrait was the property of the Moscow collector Nikolai Pavlovich Smirnov-Sokolskii.²⁴⁴

Unlike portraiture in the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition, in the first, this genre was rather overlooked by critics. Many reviewers were simply too excited

²⁴¹ Turgenev -Pisemskii, 26 February 1871, quoted in 'Primechaniia k glave II', N.N. Morgunova (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, p. 383.

²⁴² The portrait appears in *Gosudarstvennaia kartinnaia galereia Armenii*, Moscow, 1986, but not in the gallery's current on-line catalogue.

²⁴³ Ritssoni-Tret'iakov, 12 December 1870, *Pis'ma khudozhnikov Pavlu Mikhailovichu Tret'iakovu 1870-1879*, p. 34.

²⁴⁴ This reference is given in I.S. Turgenev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati vos'mi tomakh*, 28 vols. vol. IX, pis'ma 1871-72, Moscow-Leningrad 1965, p. 463.

about the exhibition in general, or else they chose to focus on one major work, usually Ge's picture *Peter I interrogating the tsarevich Aleksei (Petr I doprashivaet tsarevicha Alekseia v Petergofo)* (1871). For example, Saltykov-Shchedrin's review in *Notes From the Fatherland (Otechestvennye zapiski)*²⁴⁵ focused intensely on this work and its social and political undertones. On portraits of his fellow writers – Ostrovskii and Turgenev – Shchedrin briefly commented, at the end of the article, that the Ostrovskii portrait deserves attention along with Ge's portrait of Doctor Schiff. About the other portraits on display (including, presumably, Turgenev) he wrote, 'as I am not a specialist, I will pass over them in silence' (*kak nespetsialist; umalchivaiu*).²⁴⁶ In other reviews of the first exhibition it was Perov's portrait of Ostrovskii, rather than Ge's of Turgenev, that drew appreciative comment. Even Vladimir Stasov can only muster a 'not bad' about the portraits on show, and does not even provide readers with the information that one is of Turgenev. However, he had nothing but praise for the Ostrovskii portrait.²⁴⁷

However, even Perov could not overcome the critic's dissatisfaction with portraits of Turgenev. The review of the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition that appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski* in 1873 was, like most reviews of this exhibition, most taken with Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii but as regards the portrait of Turgenev and some others the author remarked: 'The collection of famous names is supplemented at the exhibition by the portraits of Turgenev, Maikov and Dal'; but if they add anything to Mr Perov's reputation it is from the other side of the coin – they are so flat, lifeless, dry – simply awful portraits, they should not even be exhibited here, still less be sent to tour the provinces.

²⁴⁵ *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1839-84) was one of the most important nineteenth-century 'thick' journals. Published monthly it featured the work of writers such as M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin whose review of the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition appeared in December 1871, pp. 268-276.

²⁴⁶ M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, 'Pervaia russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', *Otechestvennye zapiski*, December 1871, pp. 268-276. p. 276. Reproduced in *Russkaia progressivnaia khudozhestvennaia kritika vtoroi poloviny XIX-nachala XX veka: khrestomatiia*, pp. 126-136. See pp. 26-29 for an overview of Shchedrin's art criticism.

²⁴⁷ 'Of those portraits which Mr Perov sent to the exhibition, two (of Mrs Timasheva and Mr Stepanov) are good; but the three-quarter-length portrait of Ostrovskii, in a Russian sheepskin, is one of the most perfect works of the Russian school, just as surely as, of the three current portraits exhibited by Mr Ge, two are not bad, while the third, of the brother of the famous Italian doctor Schiff (painted in Florence in 1867, and the oldest painting in the exhibition) - this third portrait, which is simply a bust portrait, is so superlative that we must hope that it will become part of a large public collection as soon as possible.' Stasov, 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka 1871 goda', <http://hri.shef.ac.uk/rva/texts/stasov/stas09/stas09.html>.

Even Turgenev's facial features do not escape, but have been painted exactly as if cast from iron!'²⁴⁸

Turgenev's own attitude towards Perov's work seems to have been mixed. The writer's vast amount of correspondence is continually peppered with references to his portraits; inquiring if the recipient has seen the latest one and if so what do they think of it? These remarks usually appear at the end of letters or in postscripts. Turgenev does not muse over the nature and aesthetic issues concerning portrait painting, rather he expresses the frustration and excitement of being the subject of a work of art. Once the Perov portrait was complete he enthused in a letter to Ia.P. Polonskii: 'My portrait, painted by Perov, came out excellently; moreover, it will probably soon be exhibited in St Petersburg together with portraits of Dostoevskii, Maikov, Pogodin, and Dal': all excellent – especially Dostoevskii. When you see them, tell me your opinion.'²⁴⁹ By November he is pestering his brother about the portrait: 'If you see the painter Perov, remember me to him, and that he promised to make a copy of my portrait for me.'²⁵⁰ It seems that this portrait copy never materialised as over a year later Turgenev is once again asking his brother 'And have you still not seen Perov? Has he painted a copy of my portrait yet?'²⁵¹

The case of I.S. Turgenev demonstrates that even with the most talented portrait painters and a willing subject, a successful portrait may not be created. The Soviet art scholar Turchin characterized the history of Turgenev portraiture as a 'run of bad luck' (*polosoi neudach*).²⁵² Kramskoi believed that the problem lay with Turgenev himself: 'In his face there is nothing outstanding, nothing in it points to talent.'²⁵³ How a face should point to 'talent' is a rather problematic issue – how something physical should indicate a creative ability or even gift.

It is worth comparing Turgenev with other Russian writers, whose portraits were deemed to have been artistic successes. Turgenev was physically quite different to many of the other writers, although not much older than

²⁴⁸ P.M. Kovalevskii, 'Vtoraia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin russkikh khudozhnikov', *Otechestvennye zapiski*, January 1873, pp. 93-104, p. 94.

²⁴⁹ Turgenev-Ia.P. Polonskii, 28 September 1872, in I.S. Turgenev *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. IX, p. 335.

²⁵⁰ I.S. Turgenev-N.S. Turgenev, 18 November 1872, *Ibid.*, vol. X, pis'ma 1872-74, p. 27.

²⁵¹ I.S. Turgenev-N.S. Turgenev, 21 February 1873, *Ibid.*, p. 77.

²⁵² Turchin, *Portrety russkikh pisatelei*, p. 81.

²⁵³ Kramskoi quoted in *Ibid.*, p. 80.

Dostoevskii, Tolstoi or Ostrovskii his completely white hair and beard give the impression of a much older man than fifty-four, the age at which Perov painted him (second portrait). The Perov portrait deserves scrutiny as it was one of the better known portraits of Turgenev in the second half of the nineteenth century. It was exhibited at both the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition (1872-73) and at the All-Russian Exhibition in Moscow, 1882, when it was engraved by Kramskoi, along with a number of other Perov portraits and included in the illustrated catalogue. It was also exhibited in Moscow and St. Petersburg in the posthumous exhibition of the works of Perov (1882 and 1883) as well as being part of Tret'iakov's permanent collection.

Unlike most of Perov's other portraits, Turgenev is depicted practically in profile, an indication, perhaps that the artist experienced difficulties with the portrait. Turgenev does seem to have had heavy facial features: a prominent nose, deep-set eyes, a thick, well-groomed beard, and in Perov's painting at least, a furrowed brow. Compared with Dostoevskii's fine bone structure, delicate nose and wispy beard, Turgenev presents a far more solid, and less ethereal presence. In the portrait of Dostoevskii, there is the representation of a moment of thought or creation in the mind of the writer, Turgenev merely appears solemn, even rather cross and the inclusion of a book held by some rather awkwardly placed hands, seems a rather trite accessory from a painter so accomplished at producing simple portraits which express the psyche and intellect of their subject without props. Although Perov included the same device in his portrait of Maikov, in that work it seemed the poet was holding the book for a reason, that he had been caught reading and just that moment closed it, his finger still marking the page, whereas Turgenev's grasp of his book appears to be an uncomfortable pose. Compared with Perov's other subjects, the one he physically has most in common with is the merchant I.S. Kamynin (1872). There is nothing frail in Turgenev's physique as there is in the portraits of Dostoevskii and Saltykov-Shchedrin, nor does he appear in 'Russian' dress as did Ostrovskii, rather he is in beautifully tailored (presumably French or English) suits. No, there is no indication of his creativity; one cannot draw comparisons with any of his literary characters (he is too well dressed to be a provincial Russian noble) his beard is short, and provides no visual reference

point to the Orthodox church as arguably the beards of Tolstoi, Dostoevskii and Saltykov-Shchedrin can do.

I.E. Repin's relationship with Turgenev and his attempts to produce a successful portrait of the writer have been documented by I.S. Zil'bershtein in *Repin i Turgenev*²⁵⁴ and this thesis does not intend to repeat the point made by this excellent analytical study. Suffice to say that Repin, like Perov, was equally unsuccessful in his attempt to represent the writer in a manner that satisfied either Tret'iakov or the Russian critics. Repin was an artist who similarly to Ge, developed close and lengthy personal relationships with some of the writers he painted, particularly those like Turgenev who had an avid interest in art and the careers of young Russian artists.²⁵⁵ However Repin's most famous relationship was with L.N. Tolstoi²⁵⁶ and his portraits of this writer are some of the artist's most celebrated portraits. Tolstoi, like Turgenev, was a writer who had a great interest in art and aesthetics and he formulated his philosophy of art over a number of years and finally produced *What is Art? (Chto takoe iskusstvo?)* in 1898. Tolstoi's philosophy of art is not the concern of this thesis, rather we are interested in how the writer was directly involved in the creation of art through sitting for a number of portraits for painters and photographers and how they presented Tolstoi. However, many scholars have already addressed the visual representation of Tolstoi, his relationship with artists and his philosophical approach to art, and a large number of articles, studies, and monographs have been produced that cover these issues.²⁵⁷ It would be quite possible to devote an entire thesis to the visual representation of Tolstoi alone. Therefore the following section does not intend to repeat the points recounted in the letters and diaries available elsewhere. Instead, it offers a brief comparison of the visual

²⁵⁴ I.S. Zil'bershtein, *Repin i Turgenev*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1945.

²⁵⁵ Turgenev was interested in Repin and his painting as early as 1871. In a letter to Stasov he remarked 'I read your article in the *St. Petersburg Gazette* about the competition at the Academy and Repin. I was very pleased to hear that this young man is making such rapid and successful progress. He is highly talented and, what is most important, he has the undoubted *temperament* for being a painter.' Turgenev-Stasov, 10 December 1871, A.V. Knowles (ed. & trans.), *Turgenev's Letters*, London, 1983, p. 185.

²⁵⁶ Repin recorded his relationship with Tolstoi in the article 'Iz moikh obshchenii s L.N. Tolstym'. I.E. Repin, *Dalekoe blizkoe*, Moscow, 1953, pp. 377-392.

²⁵⁷ For example L.M. Vol'f (comp.), *Graf Lev Tolstoi velikii pisatel' zemli russkoi v portretakh, graviurakh, zhivopisi, skul'pture, karrikaturakh i t.d.*, St. Petersburg, 1903; Iu. Bitovt, *V pamiat' L.N. Tolstogo. Al'bom izobrazhenii Tolstogo i o Tolstom*, Moscow, 1911; L.V. Chekina, *Obraz L.N. Tolstogo v izobrazitel'nom iskusstve*, Moscow, 1960; I.A. Brodskii (comp.), *L.N. Tolstoi i khudozhniki*, Moscow, 1978.

representation of Tolstoi with the Russia's other most celebrated writer, Dostoevskii.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁸ Tolstoi and Dostoevskii are often subject to comparative studies, for example: D.S. Merezhkovskii's *L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii*, Moscow, 1903; G. Steiner, *Tolstoy or Dostoevsky*, London, 1959 and N.N. Ardens, *Dostoevskii i Tolstoi*, Moscow, 1970.

ii. Comparisons and Conflicts in the Visual Representations of Dostoevskii and Tolstoi

There are number of fundamental differences between the visual representation of Dostoevskii and Tolstoi, particularly in relation to the number and variety of images created during the period 1860 to 1899. Reference to this time frame is important, as the vast number of published portraits of Tolstoi did not occur till after 1900.²⁵⁹ However, in the period 1860 to 1899 the volume and variety of visual representations of Tolstoi is not as extensive as one might have expected, and it was Dostoevskii whose image was more likely to be found on the pages of illustrated journals and portrait-biography albums. For example, Fig. 36. is the front cover of one of Russia's most popular illustrated journals, *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, and was issued on the occasion of the writer's death. It reproduces a photograph taken by Konstantin Aleksandrovich Shapiro (1841-1900) in 1879. This image is typical of representations of Dostoevskii published at this time that were taken from photographs (see Figs. 74 & 79). Dostoevskii was usually presented in a fairly smart black suit and with a serious demeanour - a stark contrast to his dress in the Perov portrait (Fig 14).

One of the reasons why more portraits of Dostoevskii appeared in the press than Tolstoi was due to the death of the former in 1881. Not only did portraits feature on journal covers, but photographs and prints of the author were widely available to buy. The 1906 catalogue of the Dostoevskii Museum, Moscow, provides evidence of this.²⁶⁰ Before 1881 Dostoevskii's portrait appeared occasionally, for example in the 1876 portrait-biography collection *Contemporary Notable Russians (Russkie sovremennye deiateli)*. However, for 1881 the catalogue lists thirty-three occasions of the writer's portrait appearing in a journal or as a print. A number of these portraits did not however, derive

²⁵⁹ After 1900 a whole series of Tolstoi postcards was published and caricatures of the writer regularly appeared in the satirical press. In fact, caricatures of Tolstoi were so numerous that a volume of them was produced in 1908: Iu. Bitovt, *Graf L.N. Tolstoi v karikaturakh i anekdotakh*, Moscow, 1908. The representation of writers in caricatures is beyond the scope of this thesis although I did consult some volumes of caricatures during my research. For example A.I. Lebedev, *Karikaturnyi al'bom sovremennykh russkikh deiatelei*, St. Petersburg, 1879 and V. Mikhnevich, *Nashi znakomye*, St. Petersburg, 1884.

²⁶⁰ A. Dostoevskaja (comp.), *Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii Muzei. Muzei na pamiati F.M. Dostoevskago* (museum catalogue), St. Petersburg, 1906 (hereafter catalogue referred to as MnpFMD).

from photographs but were reproductions of the Perov portrait. The existence of two strands of visual representation is something Dostoevskii and Tolstoi share. In Tolstoi's case the contrast was more extreme. Without exception all painted portraits of Tolstoi presented him in his Russian peasant blouse. However in photographic portraits he often appeared in a European suit (Fig. 85).

The Perov portrait of Dostoevskii was the only portrait painted from life of the writer. When the literary publisher N.P. Polevoi asked Dostoevskii to sit for another portrait, the writer flatly refused and Polevoi had to ask Tret'iakov for a copy of the original. The only other drawn portraits (as opposed to photographed) of the writer were a sketch executed by K.A. Trutovskii in 1847 whilst Dostoevskii was studying in St. Petersburg (Fig. 37) and I.N. Kramskoi's death-bed portrait (Fig. 38). The Trutovskii portrait was not widely published until the 1890s; it accompanied Trutovskii's memoirs of Dostoevskii²⁶¹ and appeared on the front cover of *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*.²⁶² Kramskoi was asked to execute the death-bed portrait by the writer's family and it was immediately published in *Historical Herald (Istoricheskii vestnik)*.²⁶³

The existence of only one painted portrait of Dostoevskii is perhaps the most fundamental difference between the visual representations of Dostoevskii and Tolstoi. Tolstoi sat for his portrait formally on a number of occasions and was sketched informally countless times, particularly by I.E. Repin. Apart from the portraits executed of him by Kramskoi in 1873, and Ge in 1884, the writer sat for portraits by Repin and Iaroshenko. This latter portrait, painted in 1894,²⁶⁴ was not well received by the critics or public, one review described it sitting 'in a lonely dark corner, receiving no attention.'²⁶⁵ Far more well known are the portraits executed by Repin in the 1880s and 1890s. These, like the portraits by Kramskoi, were executed at Tolstoi's estate Iasnaia Poliana and as well as formal portraits of the writer, Repin depicted him working in his study and even 'working' in the fields at a plough²⁶⁶ (see Figs. 41-45).

²⁶¹ K.A. Trutovskii, 'Vospominania o Fedore Mikhailoviche Dostoevskom', *Russian Review (Russkoe obozrenie)*, 1893, pp. 212-217.

²⁶² *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 1407, 13 January 1896.

²⁶³ *Istoricheskii vestnik*, March 1881. Kramskoi was deeply affected by the death of Dostoevskii. See Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, 5 February and 14 February 1881, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, pp. 276-278.

²⁶⁴ See appendix for details.

²⁶⁵ 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 48, 19 February 1895, p. 3.

²⁶⁶ See appendix for details of the principal portraits of Tolstoi by Repin.

However with reference to the early 1870s, the portrait history of the two writers is very similar. Both had their first (or in the case of Dostoevskii only) painted portraits executed within a year of one another, at the behest of Tret'iakov, by the two foremost portraitists of the time, and both writers needed some persuasion to sit for their portraits. Tret'iakov promised Dostoevskii he would send a painter 'who will not torment you, i.e. one who will do the portrait very quickly and well.'²⁶⁷ Then, after Perov had been despatched to St. Petersburg, Dostoevskii asked that a portrait be painted of his friend the poet Maikov, a request to which Tret'iakov readily agreed, though more to please Dostoevskii than anything else. Tolstoi was much harder to persuade. As was earlier mentioned Tret'iakov had been requesting a sitting from Tolstoi since 1869 but to no avail. It was only when Kramskoi himself talked to the writer, first pointing out that a portrait would be painted of him anyway, so he might as well sit for one, and secondly, agreeing to paint another portrait simultaneously (Figs. 20 & 21). Once both portraits were complete the Tolstoi family could choose which one they preferred. Tret'iakov was not pleased at this arrangement, but had no choice but to agree.

The Perov and Kramskoi portraits both effectively represent the intellectual and creative abilities of their subject in a simple manner. Unlike the 1884 Ge portrait of Tolstoi (which was not well received), neither the Perov portrait nor the Kramskoi show the writers doing anything and do not include any visual references to their profession. Instead, both painters depict the psychological depth of their subjects. However here the portraits differ. In the case of Kramskoi and Tolstoi, the painter's depiction of the author's mental strength is supported by the depiction of Tolstoi's physical bulk and fierce demeanour. Unlike Perov, who placed Dostoevskii at a three-quarter angle, Kramskoi positioned Tolstoi face on and directs his gaze straight at the viewer. This confrontational pose is not only seen in Kramskoi's portrait, but also in K.A. Shapiro's photograph (Fig. 85). Tolstoi, although slightly turned, stares out defiantly. In the Kramskoi portrait chosen by Tolstoi and his wife, the writer's head is slightly tilted and this softens his expression, a reason perhaps why this

²⁶⁷ Tret'iakov–Dostoevskii, 31 March 1872, quoted in 'Novonaidennye i zabytye pis'ma Dostoevskogo', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 86, 1973, p. 120.

work was selected for their home. In contrast, Perov depicts Dostoevskii completely detached from his surroundings. According to Dostoevskii's wife, Perov managed to depict the writer's 'most characteristic expression, namely, the one he had when he was absorbed in thought about his work. [...] he seemed to be looking inside himself.'²⁶⁸ Perov did not express his opinions on his work extensively in letters, but as regards this portrait and the one of Maikov he wrote to Tret'iakov:

The portraits are good, successful. Dostoevskii advised me not to alter the head of Maikov more, finding the expression entirely satisfactory. Maikov also speaks most favourably about the portrait of Dostoevskii. [...] but the truth is as to how they are painted, whether they are good or not, I can't say, but what's for sure is that there's nothing 'portrait-like' about them, it seems to me, that expressed in them is the essential character of writer and poet.²⁶⁹

Although the main success of both the Kramskoi and the Perov portrait is due to the artists' ability to communicate the mental processes of both writers, we should not neglect the physical depiction of their subjects. In contrast to Tolstoi's robust appearance Dostoevskii seems rather frail and drawn. This aspect of the portrait was praised in *New Times* (*Novoe vremia*) as a representation of Dostoevskii's creativity: 'in the pallid and sickly-fatigued face is reflected that nervous and strained mood, with which all the works of this author are imbued.'²⁷⁰ However, Dostoevskii also had his critics who used his physical appearance and trance like state in the portrait to attack the author. Vsevolod Solov'ev recalled that Dostoevskii's critics called the author 'a madman, a maniac, an apostate, a traitor, they even invited the public to go to the exhibition at the Academy of Arts [the 2nd TAE] and see there the portrait of Dostoevskii by Perov, as direct evidence that this is a mad person, whose place is in an asylum.'²⁷¹

Dostoevskii's delicacy is exaggerated by the large, rather dirty and shabby looking jacket he wears. This is the most intriguing element of the portrait. Firstly, it seems odd that Dostoevskii would wear such a jacket indoors

²⁶⁸ A. Dostoevskaya, *Dostoevsky Reminiscences*, London, 1976, p. 188.

²⁶⁹ Dostoevskii-Tret'iakov, 10 May 1872, *Pis'ma khudozhnikov P.M. Tret'iakovu*, p. 77.

²⁷⁰ 'Vtoraia peredvizhnaiia vystavka kartin', *Novoe vremia*, 6 January 1873, quoted in 'Novonaidennye i zabytye pis'ma Dostoevskogo', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 86, 1973, p. 122.

²⁷¹ V.S. Solov'ev, quoted in K. Tiunkina (comp.), *F.M. Dostoevskii v vospominaniakh sovremennikov*, vol. II, Moscow, 1990, p. 209.

during May and secondly, this portrait was for public display – surely Dostoevskii would have wanted to look smart, as he does in his photographic portraits? Dostoevskii did not record his opinion on his portrait, but the writer did express his thoughts on portraiture in general a year after sitting for Perov. His belief was that the aim of the portraitist was to seek out ‘that moment when the subject most resembles his self.’ Did Dostoevskii not object to his portrayal in this jacket because he understood that this, rather than a smart suit, best represented ‘his self’? A similar conclusion can be made as regards the two strands of Tolstoi’s visual representation.

Tolstoi had been photographed as early as 1868 wearing his peasant blouse (Fig. 70): the antithesis of the usual European dress of a Russian noble. However, Kramskoi’s work was the first painted portrait of the writer in what was to become the fundamental element of the Tolstoi iconography. Subsequent painted portraits all depicted Tolstoi in variations of this dress, sometimes the shirt was blue, sometimes black, sometimes belted. Again, why did Tolstoi choose to be portrayed like this when many photographic portraits of him show him in European dress? Largely this is due to the fact that most portraits were painted at Iasnaia Poliana, where Tolstoi wore this dress daily. But like Dostoevskii, did Tolstoi believe that in this dress, rather than a European suit, he most resembled ‘his self’? I would argue that in Tolstoi’s case, the repeated depiction of the writer in the peasant blouse was due to a conscious decision by the writer that this was how he wished to be portrayed in portraits that he knew would be on public display in the Tret’iakov Gallery and in *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions. Tolstoi’s decision to appear in this costume communicates his personal, professional and national identities to the viewer. He wears a traditional Russian dress, the dress of the *narod*, and in choosing to adopt it demonstrates his personal rejection of the conventions of Russian society. In terms of his professional identity, Tolstoi’s appearance in Kramskoi’s portrait brings to mind his character of Levin from *Anna Karenina*, as does Repin’s picture of Tolstoi working the fields. The Kramskoi portrait was painted whilst Tolstoi had just begun *Anna Karenina* so the painter did not consciously bring to life Levin, although Tolstoi used Kramskoi as the basis for the character Mikhailov in the novel.

Kramskoi's portrait of Tolstoi laid the foundation for a Tolstoi iconography that would be continued in portraits by Ge and Repin. It can be seen as a point of departure that would be developed in other painted and photographic portraits. Perov's portrait in contrast, existed in isolation and although numerous reproductions of it were made, no other portrait attempted to replicate the work. Therefore it holds a unique position in the history of portraits of Russian writers; Kramskoi called it 'one of the best portraits of the Russian school.'²⁷² Not only did it receive a large amount of favourable press coverage when displayed in the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions (a rare achievement for a portrait) but it continued to be kept in the public consciousness through inclusion in subsequent individual exhibitions and in the Tret'iakov Gallery. At the end of the nineteenth century when printed guides to the Tret'iakov Gallery began to be issued, this portrait was always mentioned. A rather intellectual overview of the gallery from 1893 noted 'Dostoevskii has been presented not only with photographic precision, but also with all his own inner "I" which for us has immeasurably more interest than facial features.'²⁷³ Even a family guide book from 1898 remarked 'looking at this portrait you notice a strained stare, in the outline of the lips something of the kind of the inner life, the expression of character, and not only the likeness of a person's facial features.'²⁷⁴

Only one other portrait of Dostoevskii was deemed to have been so successful in its ability to depict the inner 'I' of the writer - a photographic portrait taken by M.M. Panov in Moscow, 1880, whilst the writer was in the city for the Pushkin celebrations (Fig. 39). For Anna Dostoevskaia it was the 'most successful'²⁷⁵ of the many photographs of her husband and Kramskoi published an article in which he argued the Panov portrait was a representation of Dostoevskii equal to that of Perov, that 'in the face of Dostoevskii we can perceive the significance and depth of his thoughts.'²⁷⁶

²⁷² I.N. Kramskoi, 'O Portrete F.M. Dostoevskago'. This originally appeared anonymously in *Art Journal (Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal)*, March 1881. It was reproduced in Stasov (ed.), *Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi*, p. 669.

²⁷³ A.P. Novitskii, *A Brief Historical overview of P.M. Tret'iakov's Picture Gallery (Kratkii istoricheskii obzor' kartinnoi galerei P.M. Tret'iakova)*, Moscow, 1893, p. 50.

²⁷⁴ O.P. Orlova, *Two Tours with Children around the Tret'iakov Gallery (Dva poseshcheniia s de'ti Tret'iakovskoi galerei)*, Moscow, 1898, p. 8.

²⁷⁵ A. Dostoevskaia, *Dostoevsky Reminiscences*, p. 335.

²⁷⁶ Kramskoi, 'O Portrete F.M. Dostoevskago', p. 669.

In the portraits of Tolstoi by Kramskoi, Ge and Repin the artists also attempted to represent the inner nature of the writer but apart from Kramskoi, were less successful. The Kramskoi portrait was not included in any *Peredvizhniki* exhibition, but when Ge and Repin exhibited their two formal portraits of Tolstoi they were not well received. The Ge portrait was criticized for not showing the writer's face and many reviews found problems with the technique used by Repin in his 1887 portrait: 'the face of this genius writer we cannot see for the white highlights of paint.'²⁷⁷ Alongside this portrait was exhibited a small painted sketch Repin had made whilst Tolstoi ploughed the fields. This is now one of the most famous representations of the writer, and it was entrenched in the Russian public consciousness enough by 1903 for *The Spark (Iskra)* to use it as the basis for a caricature on the relationship between Tolstoi and Maksim Gorkii (Fig. 43).

Repin's portrait and the ploughing sketch were both discussed in V.V. Stasov's article 'A Portrait of Lev Tolstoi'²⁷⁸ in which the critic argued that these new works by Repin were long over due, as Kramskoi's portrait, good as it was, was out of date. Stasov has nothing but praise for both works but it is his remarks on the ploughing sketch that are most interesting. This picture is small and Tolstoi's face cannot be seen, one reviewer stated: 'it is ordinary sketch and is not the work to judge the talent of Mr Repin by.'²⁷⁹ However Stasov, a champion of both Repin and Tolstoi, argued that 'the entire composition is heroic (*bogatyrskaa*), powerful [...] the expression of strength, devotion to one's work, that boundless national type and way (*sklad*).'²⁸⁰ Stasov then informed readers that he had recommended that this picture be chromolithographed immediately and the picture was reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* in 1888. This however, went against the initial wishes of Tolstoi and his wife who did not want this image widely reproduced. It highlights the problem painters faced in

²⁷⁷ 'XVI vystavka kartin tovarishchestva peredvizhnikov', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, 1 March 1888, p. 2.

²⁷⁸ V.V. Stasov, 'Portret L'va Tolstogo'. First published in *News and Stock exchange Gazette (Novosti i birzhevaia gazeta)*, 21 September 1887. Reproduced in V.V. Stasov, *Stat'i i zametki, publikovavshiesia v gazetakh i ne voshedshie v knizhnye izdaniia*, Moscow, 1952, pp. 94-96.

²⁷⁹ 'XVI vystavka kartin tovarishchestva peredvizhnikov', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, 29 February 1888, p. 2.

²⁸⁰ Stasov, 'Portret L'va Tolstogo', p. 95.

attempting to create a portrait of a public figure that included the representation of aspects of personal identity.

Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii successfully represented the writer's personal and professional identities; they engaged with one another and the result is a portrait in which Dostoevskii's intellectual strength transcends his physical weakness. However, the depiction of Dostoevskii's weakness and in such peculiar attire was a risk, and the writer's enemies did comment on it. Kramskoi's portrait of Tolstoi was quite different in that it represented a strong individual physically and intellectually, who in addition confidently displayed his national identity through his dress. However when Repin wanted to reproduce his picture of the great writer engaged in ploughing, rather than writing or reading, the Count and his family were reluctant - a too public exposure, perhaps, of a private activity. Both Dostoevskii and Tolstoi must have been conscious that the portraits created by Perov, Kramskoi, Ge and Repin would be put on show to the Russian public and receive attention in the press. The next section addresses the ways in which critics discussed *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions and in particular, how portraits of Russian writers were communicated to Russian readers.

Section iii.

Hanging on Walls and Printed on Pages, the Writer takes up Space

The creation of a picture is only the first stage in a work's existence; the second stage is the display of that work to an audience and the reception it receives from those that are neither its author nor (in the case of portraiture) subject. In the second half of the nineteenth century the opportunities for an audience to view pictures grew, as did the audience itself. Indeed in Russia, as in the rest of Europe, visual cultural became increasingly more sophisticated and diverse and an 'exhibition culture' was one of the most visible achievements of the nineteenth century. The role of exhibitions, museums and art galleries as representations of a developing civil society and bourgeoisie, and as symbols of modernity has been subject to much research and debate.²⁸¹ It is beyond the scope of this study to enter into this particular academic arena. However, before discussing the exhibition of art, and of portraits in particular, it is worth addressing one of the underlying reasons for the growth of exhibitions in this period and how it is relevant to the study of the visual representation of Russian writers. Joseph Bradley has argued that common to late imperial Russian exhibition culture was an overwhelming desire to educate and to encourage feelings of national and civic pride in the native visitor (and those of admiration and envy in the foreigner) through displays of national achievement. The contribution exhibition culture could make to national self-esteem was particularly important, so 'foreigners would recognize that Russia was truly an educated, well-ordered European nation' but more significantly as a means of 'restoring faith in the nation's strength'.²⁸² A statement made in a guide book to the 1896 All-Russian Nizhni-Novgorod Exhibition supports this supposition:

At this, the commencement of a new reign, it is fit and proper that we should rejoice over the progress of our industries and creative power; while the success achieved in the past is in itself the best guarantee of

²⁸¹ There are numerous works that address the creation and role of museums and galleries in the nineteenth century. For example, B. Taylor, *Art for the Nation. Exhibitions and the London Public 1747-2001*, New Brunswick, 1999; B. Black, *On Exhibit: Victorians and Their Museums*, Charlottesville & London, 2000; N. Prior, *Museums and Modernity. Art Galleries and the Making of Modern Culture*, Oxford, 2002.

²⁸² Bradley, 'Voluntary Associations, Civic Culture, and *Obshchestvennost*' in Moscow', p. 146.

further development.²⁸³

One of the greatest achievements of Russia's 'creative power' in the nineteenth century was her literature. Therefore, it was arguably not only for the painterly skills of Kramskoi and Perov that their respective portraits of Tolstoi and Dostoevskii were selected as Russian entries to the 1878 Paris World exhibition²⁸⁴ and later included in the 1882 All-Russian Exhibition. These portraits represented the success of both a Russian school of painting and Russian literature. In a review of the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition the critic for *Golos* implicitly united the two in his praise.

Perov exhibits yet other portraits - of Maikov, Dal', Turgenev (an unusual use of light) and Dostoevskii, all are worthy of note for the talented portraitist. Also very good are [...] the portraits of Nekrasov and Saltykov by Ge, but they some what suffer from being in the vicinity of the exemplary portraits of Perov. In any case, our portraitists announce themselves in this present exhibition with full splendour, in this respect we have no need to envy foreigners.²⁸⁵

The aim of this section is to examine the ways in which developments in exhibition culture and print culture in Russia provided the viewer or reader with more occasions to see images of writers and additionally, varied the kind of images that were available. Yet equal in significance to opportunities to *see* images of writers, was the opportunity to *read* about them. The development of

²⁸³ The Imperial Commission for the Nijni Novgorod Exhibition, *Pan-Russian Exhibition of 1896 in Nijni Novgorod. Guide-Book to the Town, the Fair, and the Exhibition*, St. Petersburg, 1896, p. 2.

²⁸⁴ This thesis has not addressed the exhibition of Russian works of art overseas. Nevertheless, the 1878 Paris World Exhibition deserves mention as a number of Russian writers' portraits were shown there and the exhibition received coverage in the Russian press. Prior to travelling to Paris, the paintings that were selected were shown at the Academy of Arts. See G. Iu. Sternin, 'Vsemirnaia parizhskaia vystavka 1878 g i khudozhestvennaia zhizn' Rossii', *Khudozhestvennaia zhizn' Rossii vtoroi poloviny XIX veka 70-80-e gody*, Moscow, 1997 pp. 126-144.

²⁸⁵ 'Peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka v Akademii Khudozhestv', *Golos*, no. 12, 12 January 1873, p. 2. For the location of reviews and articles on the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions I have mainly relied on the bibliographical supplements to N.P. Sobko's illustrated catalogues of the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions. *Illustrirovannyi katalog XVIII-i peredvizhnoi vystavki 'Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok'* included the supplement M.P. Fedorov (comp.), 'Perechen statei o pervykh 15-ti peredvizhnykh vystavakh v russkikh stolichnykh i provintsialnykh zhurnalakh 1871-1888gg.', St. Petersburg, 1890. This comprehensive inventory included the authors of articles (or pseudonyms) where possible, but under the entry for *Golos* none was given. Three other excellent sources for information on nineteenth-century art critics that I consulted were N.I. Bespalova & V.V. Vanslov (eds.), *Russkaia progressivnaia khudozhestvennaia kritika vtoroi poloviny XIX-nachala XX veka: khrestomatiia*, Moscow, 1977; N.I. Bespalova & A.G. Vereschagina, *Russkaia progressivnaia khudozhestvennaia kritika vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1979 and the Russian Visual Arts website.

newspapers and journals in this period served a dual purpose: Illustrated journals were able to reproduce portraits of writers in their pages or publish separate compilation volumes of portraits, but in addition, a whole range of publications passed comment on art exhibitions in Russia, particularly those of the *Peredvizhniki*. From the intellectual who took *Otechestvennye zapiski* to the family who subscribed to *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* the whole ‘imagined community’ of the Russian reading public had access to information on developments in Russian art and printed reproductions of the art itself.

Exhibitions and Galleries

By the end of the nineteenth century, exhibition culture flourished in the Russian Empire as it did elsewhere in Western Europe. It is important to differentiate between ‘art exhibitions’ and exhibitions in general, although sometimes the boundaries between the two became blurred. Art exhibitions are the primary concern here, but the development of a wider exhibition culture is relevant, as a greater number of people throughout the Russian Empire became more accustomed to taking on the role of spectator, participant and judge.²⁸⁶

The display of art and artefacts for public perusal had its origins in Russia in the reign of Peter I (1682-1725) when the tsar established a *Kunstkammer* in 1714.²⁸⁷ However, the exhibits in this museum, or rather collection, were mostly examples of the exotic, grotesque or macabre, rather than the picturesque and spiritually uplifting, and it was Peter’s introduction of Greek, Roman and Italian sculpture into the Summer Palace Gardens that provides a more appropriate point of departure for the history of the reception of

²⁸⁶ The 1851 Great Exhibition, held in the Crystal Palace, London, is frequently seen as a point of departure and a landmark event for nineteenth-century exhibition culture. The 1851 Exhibition was not the first large-scale event to be staged, but is viewed by scholars as the most significant due to its international nature and organizational structure. See P. Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas. The Expositions Universelle*, Manchester, 1988. Exhibitions were held to showcase all manner of topics and subjects and could last weeks, months, or even years. The first public exhibition of Russian manufacturing had been held in 1829 and from this point onwards all sorts of items and occupations were put on show for the paying public, although unsurprisingly, organized exhibitions of agricultural industry seem to have been particularly prevalent. Indeed, exhibitions concerned with these subjects in various parts of the empire totalled 588 between 1843 and 1887. Iu.A. Nikitin, *Vystavochnyi Peterburg. Ot ekspozitsionnoi zalyi do LENEKSPO*, Cherepovets, 2003, p. 9. However, the most bizarre topics were afforded exhibition space and at the end of the nineteenth century exhibitions were held concerned with hygiene, prisons, and between 1897-1899 a fire-fighting exhibition travelled along the Volga (it was Russia’s first ‘floating’ exhibition) and attracted over 120,000 visitors.

²⁸⁷ Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, pp. 315-316.

art in Russia.²⁸⁸ Although Peter and a few members of the Russian nobility began to collect and commission works of art, most notably portraiture, large scale art collecting did not begin until the reign of Catherine II. The reign of Catherine was a turning point for art in Russia as it saw the reorganization of the Imperial Academy of Arts in St. Petersburg and through Catherine's avid collecting of European art, the beginning of Russia's largest and most venerated art collection, the Hermitage. In the first ten years of her reign Catherine bought two thousand pictures and to house her growing collection she commissioned the construction of a pavilion onto her Winter Palace in St. Petersburg. Throughout her reign the collection and the buildings that housed it grew, but the Hermitage could never have been considered a public gallery or a museum.²⁸⁹ This state of affairs continued well into the nineteenth century. Admittance to the collection was restrictive, unless one was a member of the court or an artist. From 1852 a ticket system was introduced but this was for a select few and a strict dress code was enforced. The ticketing system was abolished in 1866 and by 1880 the Hermitage attracted fifty thousand visitors, but it was only in 1922 that all restrictions were lifted.²⁹⁰

The Imperial Academy of Arts was an institution that throughout the nineteenth century offered the Russian public opportunities to see past and contemporary works of art in the Academy museum and in its exhibition halls. This space housed the Academy's own annual exhibition (which included works by European and Russian artists) as well as those exhibitions arranged by other organizations such as the *Peredvizhniki*, who staged their first four St. Petersburg exhibitions (1871-1875) there.²⁹¹ By the 1860s the annual Academy exhibitions had become a well-established part of the St. Petersburg society season; a fact affirmed by the many caricatures and humorous sketches that

²⁸⁸ Yet it should be noted that Peter's motives for exhibiting natural 'monsters' was fundamentally the same as exhibiting classical statuary – he believed the Russian nobility needed education in all areas, including sciences and classical civilisation, to bring it up to the standard of its European counterparts.

²⁸⁹ For a history of the foundation and development of the Hermitage Collection see G. Norman, *The Hermitage*, London, 1997.

²⁹⁰ Gray, *Russian Genre Painting*, p. 19.

²⁹¹ The Academy published the first exhibition catalogue in 1766 but it was not until 1814 and the move of the institution to a new location on the banks of the Neva that the Academy Exhibitions became a regular feature of St. Petersburg society life. Adlam, 'Realist Aesthetics in Nineteenth-Century Russian Art Writing', p. 7. Artists not associated with the Academy were allowed to exhibit there from 1799. <http://hri.shef.ac.uk/rva/timeline/timeline.html>.

appeared in journals such as the *Alarm Clock (Budil'nik)* and *Iskra*, which gently satirized art and audience. Besides the halls of the Academy there were a number of locations where works of art were displayed. There were permanent collections owned by private individuals, but the access the public had to these was often very limited, dependent on the will of the owner and the social and professional status of the audience. For example the collection of Aleksandr Stroganov (1733-1811) was available only to art connoisseurs and students to view. This state of affairs continued into the twentieth century. A guidebook published in 1904 lamented the fact that 'as regards private collections, admission to them completely depends upon the discretion of the owner, and in palaces only cursory and superficial examinations under the hurried guidance of the palace attendants are possible.'²⁹² Two private collections of Western European art that were accessible to the public belonged to the Kushelev-Bezborodko family in St. Petersburg and the Golitsyn family in Moscow.²⁹³ The two collections opened in 1846 and 1865 respectively, but neither existed independently for any length of time. The Kushelev-Bezborodko collection transferred to the Academy where it opened to the public in its new location in 1862. Rosalind Gray notes that one of the most distinctive features about the Kushelev-Bezborodko picture collection was that it did not require visitors to conform to standards of dress. In contrast the Golitsyn collection barred entry to peasants and those 'shod in bast shoes', although there was no entrance fee.²⁹⁴

The first half of the nineteenth century was a period of emergence and development for Russian art and its reception. Not only did Karl Briullov's *Last Day of Pompeii* (1830-33) bring international attention to Russian art, inside Russia the reception of Russian art – art criticism – was beginning to become an established form of public discourse presented in journals, including the first specialist Russian art journals.²⁹⁵ The first critical review of a Russian art

²⁹² D.D. Ivanov, *Ob 'iasnitel'nyi putevoditel' po khudozhestvennym sobraniiam Peterburga*, St. Petersburg, 1904, p. 323.

²⁹³ R.P. Gray, 'The Golitsyn and Kushelev-Bezborodko Collections and their Role in the Evolution of Public Art Galleries in Russia', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. XXXI, Oxford, 1988, pp. 51-67.

²⁹⁴ Gray, *Russian Genre Painting*, p. 29.

²⁹⁵ The first Russian Fine Art journal was established in 1823, *The Journal of Fine Arts (Zhurnal iziashchnykh iskusstv)* (1823-1825). This was followed by the *Pictorial Review (Zhivopisnoe obozrenie)* (1835-1841)- not to be confused with a later journal of the same name - and *The Gazette of Fine Arts (Khudozhestvennaia gazeta)* (1836-41).

exhibition was Karl Batiushkov's 'A Stroll to the Academy of Arts' (*Progulka v Akademiyu khudozhestv*) which appeared in the journal *Son of the Fatherland* (*Syn otechestva*) in 1814. Both international and Russian art were commented upon in a number of the literary journals in the first half of the nineteenth century; of particular note are the articles that appeared in *Sovremennik* in the 1840s.

The first state art museum to open in Russia was the Rumiantsev Museum in Moscow in May 1862. As Gray has pointed out, this event marked a turning point for the cultural fortunes of Moscow, which would continue with the development of the Moscow School of Painting and Sculpture, the role of Moscow based artists in the *Peredvizhniki*, and the growth of the Tret'iakov Gallery.²⁹⁶ The Rumiantsev Museum was based on the collection of the Rumiantsev family, and its holdings not only included pictures but also books, manuscripts,²⁹⁷ ethnographic and archaeological items. With regards to art, the highlight of the collection was Aleksandr Andreevich Ivanov's masterpiece *Christ's Appearance to the People* (*Iavlenie Khrista narodu*) (1837-57). This was something of a landmark work as it was an example of a painting by a Russian artist attracting crowds, and in Moscow rather than St. Petersburg. Indeed, Moscow was to lead the way in the exhibition of Russian art in Russia. Although the Hermitage was reorganized in 1824 in order to create a room devoted to Russian painting,²⁹⁸ St. Petersburg did not have a *national* gallery until the Russian Museum of Aleksandr III opened in 1898 (now the State Russian Museum).²⁹⁹ On opening, the Russian Museum contained four hundred and forty-five pictures, one hundred and eleven sculptures and nine hundred and eighty-one drawings and watercolours,³⁰⁰ including some portraits of writers.³⁰¹

²⁹⁶ Gray, *Russian Genre Painting*, p. 40.

²⁹⁷ For a brief history of the Rumiantsev book and manuscript collections see V. Churbanov, 'Rumiantsev's Ark: Library of a Nation', *Rossica*, Autumn 2003-Winter 2004, pp. 4-24.

²⁹⁸ Norman, *The Hermitage*, p. 57.

²⁹⁹ Proposals for a Russian National Museum had been in existence since 1817 when the article 'Predlozhenie ob uchrezhdenii russkogo national'nago muzeia', was printed in *Syn otechestva*. See K. Tyner Thomas, 'Collecting the Fatherland. Early-Nineteenth-Century Proposals for a Russian National Museum', in J. Burbank & D.L. Ransel (eds.), *Imperial Russia. New Histories for the Empire*, Bloomington, Ind., 1998, pp. 91-107.

³⁰⁰ T.B. Vilinbakhov et al. (comps.), *Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei Leningrad*, Leningrad, 1991.

³⁰¹ In the 1899 Russian Museum catalogue Ge's portrait of Saltykov-Shchedrin is listed as a gift from Baroness E.M. Disterlo, the writer's daughter. *Katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Russkogo muzeia Imperatora Aleksandra III*, St. Petersburg, 1899, p. 55. Also listed in this

The Russian Museum's initial holdings may seem impressive until one compares it to the Russian works of art Tret'iakov had collected by 1893. In an article published in December of that year that celebrated the presentation of the gallery to Moscow, Stasov compared the Tret'iakov collection most favourably against other galleries in Europe such as the National Gallery, London and the RijksMuseum, Amsterdam. Stasov argued that the Tret'iakov Gallery was more than its official name suggested, that it was truly a 'national' gallery due to its overwhelming number of Russian works of art, and, compared to other galleries in Russia, Stasov had a valid point. According to the critic's estimates, in 1893 the Prianishnikov Gallery in the Rumiantsev Museum held one hundred and forty Russian works of art, the Hermitage held seventy-five and the Imperial Academy only fourteen, but 'in the Tret'iakov Gallery the number of pictures by Russia artists is 1,276! Sufficiently impressive figures and comparisons it appears.'³⁰²

In the second half of the nineteenth century the two phenomena that are of most relevance to this thesis are the exhibition of works by *Peredvizhniki* artists and the formation, opening and finally donation to the city of Moscow, of the Municipal Gallery of Pavel and Sergei Tret'iakov.³⁰³ Although the final destination for the Tret'iakov commissions was his Moscow Gallery, in many cases the first opportunity for the Russian public to view a portrait ordered by Tret'iakov was at one of the Society's travelling exhibitions. In the 1880s, exhibitions developed further with the publication of illustrated exhibition guidebooks, as opposed to an exhibition inventory (*ukazatel'*). Also, the management and organization of exhibitions underwent greater scrutiny, with audiences more demanding in their expectations of exhibitions. Writers' portraits appeared at a number of exhibitions besides those staged by the *Peredvizhniki*. Notable events included the posthumous exhibition of the works

catalogue is a portrait of Tolstoi by Repin, p. 64. Ge's portrait of Nekrasov was presented to the Russian Museum in 1905 from the Novgorod *uezdnoi zemskoi upravu*. *Katalog khudozhestvennago otdela russkogo muzeia imperatora Aleksandra III*, St. Petersburg, 1911, p. 137.

³⁰² V.V. Stasov, 'Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov i ego kartinnaia gallereia'. First published in *Russkaia starina*, December 1893, pp. 569-608. Reproduced in V.V. Stasov, *Stat'i i zametki, ne voshedshie v sobraniia sochinenii*, Moscow, 1954, pp. 376-416, p. 388.

³⁰³ This was the name of the gallery printed on its first published catalogue in 1893, *Opis' khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii gorodskoi galerei Pavla i Sergeia Tret'iakovykh*, Moscow, 1893.

of Perov (1882-1883), the posthumous exhibition of the works of Kramskoi (1887) and the Fine Art Section of the 1882 All-Russian (*Vserossiiskaia*) Exhibition, Moscow. Given Russia's vast geography and the variety of its industries and populace, the All-Russian exhibitions were almost of equal scope to the *Expositions Universelle* of London, Paris or Vienna. The two most substantial All-Russian exhibitions were the 1882 Moscow exhibition and one held in Nizhnii-Novgorod in 1896. The Moscow exhibition was an unprecedented event in Russia; it covered over thirty hectares, lasted over four months and attracted over one million visitors who could keep up with events by reading the exhibition's own weekly journal or daily newspaper.³⁰⁴ The 1896 exhibition was on an even grander scale and the official guidebook, published simultaneously in Russian, English, French and German editions, contained information on banks, post offices, despatch offices, restaurants and theatres, all of which were located within the exhibition grounds.³⁰⁵ The 1880s and 1890s saw the rise of visual culture of which exhibitions were only part of; advertising, packaging, printing all continued to provide a greater diversity of images to the Russian public. Printing not only facilitated the better organization and promotion of exhibitions, it became the subject of exhibitions. The 1882 All-Russian Exhibition included a photography section, which displayed a number of portraits of writers by the photographer K.A. Shapiro. In 1888 the first photography exhibition was opened in St. Petersburg by the Imperial Russian

³⁰⁴ Nikitin remarks that many European encyclopaedias at the time referred to the event as a world exhibition. He comments that 'this does not correspond to reality, but represents flattering evidence of the international respect and fame of Russian industrial exhibitions'. *Vystavochnyi Peterburg*, p. 11.

³⁰⁵ The Imperial Commission for the Nijni Novgorod Exhibition. *Pan-Russian Exhibition of 1896 in Nijni Novgorod. Guide-Book*, pp. 189-231. Although the Crystal Palace Exhibition raised standards and expectations for International Exhibitions and the display of industrial and commercial achievements within them, no works of art were shown in 1851 as these were seen as being outside the exhibition's remit. Indeed, the first International Exhibition to include a Fine Art Section (the four classes of painting, sculpture, architecture and engraving) was the 1855 Paris Exhibition, see E. Gilmore Holt, *The Expanding World of Art, 1874-1902*, New Haven and London, 1988. Fifteen major international exhibitions were held between 1851-1900 in Europe, America and Australia, but Russia existed somewhere on the periphery of this international exhibition circuit; it entered events with varying degrees of success yet never staged a major International Exhibition itself. The Russian art entered in the 1862 London International Exhibition was not well received and the focus of criticism from Stasov who argued its imitative nature demonstrated all that was wrong with art in Russia and the need for a 'Russian School' of painting. Almost fifty years later, at the 1900 Paris Exhibition, Russian art was one of the chief attractions and successes of the event.

Technical Society³⁰⁶ and this was followed in 1889 by the All-Russian Photographic Exhibition in Moscow. Along with photography exhibitions other forms of image reproduction began to be seriously considered. In 1897 the Society for the Encouragement of Arts opened in St. Petersburg the International Exhibition of the Artistic Poster. This event was public recognition for a new form of graphic art in Russia and the event attracted over seventy artists from thirteen countries.³⁰⁷

The Travelling Exhibitions

As well as the dichotomous nature of the *Peredvizhniki* endeavour – to educate and to profit – another area of the organization that was more pluralistic than has often been acknowledged by scholars was the Society's membership and the works they produced. Founding members of the *Peredvizhniki* included some of Russia's best known artists and exponents of Russian realist art such as Kramskoi, Perov and Ge, all of whom exhibited a variety of works – portraits, Russian history paintings, genre scenes - in the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions. However, those pictures that received the most contemporary critical attention were not necessarily the ones that advocated social reforms but those that were entertaining, depicted well-known national or historic figures, or had a strong narrative element, such as Perov's *The Bird catchers (Ptitselov)* (1870) or *Hunters at Rest (Okhotniki na privale)* (1871) (Fig. 46). The *Peredvizhniki* also included artists who concentrated on a particular subject matter, such as landscape. Landscape paintings comprised a large proportion of works shown in the travelling exhibitions, and not only Russian landscapes; the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition included a number of paintings of French scenes by Karl Fedorovich Gun (1830-1877) alongside views of the Russian countryside by Ivan Ivanovich Shishkin (1831-1898) and Aleksei Petrovich Bogoliubov (1824-1896). In this first exhibition, which toured St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kiev and Khar'kov and attracted over 29,000 visitors, one sculpture and forty-six

³⁰⁶ On the 1888 photographic exhibition the *Petersburg Bulletin (Peterburgskii listok)* reported: 'The public quite enthusiastically visit the photographic exhibition, from 3 to 25 February around six thousand people attended.' 'Na fotograficheskoi vystavke', *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 57, 27 February 1888, p. 2.

³⁰⁷ N.I. Baburina, *Russkii plakat. Vtoraia polovina XIX-nachalo XX veka*, Leningrad, 1988.

paintings were shown; of these paintings over twenty were landscapes.³⁰⁸ Christopher Ely discusses the presence of landscape painting in the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions and the fact that their dominance ‘renders problematic the common assumption that these painters constituted a politically and morally engaged movement in the arts.’³⁰⁹ The main reason for the inclusion of landscapes is a practical one; landscapes were commercially successful and provided invaluable sales for the Society. Ely makes the point that for this reason, Stasov, for whom the social and moral message of a work of art was all-important, ‘praised landscapes for their strict fidelity to nature [...] but usually mentioned them only briefly at the tail end of his reviews.’³¹⁰ However, not all critics shared Stasov’s ideological approach to the arts and many, particularly those writing for the general reader rather than the intellectual, focused their reviews on landscapes and entertaining genre scenes. If landscape and genre painting comprised the most popular works, what was the role of portraiture in the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions and in the critical reviews of exhibitions? After all, people rarely want to buy a portrait of someone else from an exhibition, but rather choose to commission their own likeness or that of a family member directly from the artist. Yet portraiture made up a considerable percentage of works included in *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions. *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* remarked on the large number of portraits in the second exhibition (1872) and wondered if it would deter visitors: ‘In general, this exhibition is abundant with portraits; they total twelve, that is, 25% of the entire number of works on display.’³¹¹

The inclusion of portraits in the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions is an interesting phenomenon as many were never for sale, but seem to have served a

³⁰⁸ *Tpkhv*, vol. I, pp. 60–67. The original *otchet* reproduced in the book lists the number of works in the first exhibition as 82. *Tpkhv* vol. I, p. 71. This is explained by the fact there was a core collection of 46 works by well known artists such as Perov and Ge, which was added to with works from provincial artists such as F.I. Iasnovskii, who was based in the Ukraine and is listed as showing 10 landscape studies (although he is not listed in the original line up).

³⁰⁹ C. Ely, *This Meager Nature. Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*, De Kalb, Illinois, 2002, p. 195.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 196.

³¹¹ ‘N’/ A.I. Somov, ‘Vtoraia peredvizhnaia vystavka’, *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*, no.23, 23 January 1873, p.1. The above article is signed simply ‘N’ but in *Illiustrirovannyi katalog XVII-i peredvizhnoi vystavki, ‘Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok’*, St. Petersburg, 1889, N.P. Sobko provided a list of pseudonyms of critics who had previously reviewed *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions. ‘N’ is given as Somov. Andrei Ivanovich Somov (1830–

dual purpose, promotional in its nature. Firstly, they showcased the artist's skill as a portraitist, and secondly, some depicted an important or famous individual in Russian society whose image visitors, defying the predication of *Sankt-Petersburgskie vedomosti*, would want to see. In the second half of the nineteenth century Russia, in common with the rest of Europe and America, witnessed the rise of the idea of celebrity, which occurred at the same time as rapid progression in photographic and print technology. Indeed, the development of the two were mutually interdependent, as Roger Hargreaves has noted: 'Fame and photography were drawn together in the mid-nineteenth century by an almost innate magnetic impulse.'³¹² Linda Hughes makes the point with even greater strength with reference to the position of the writer at this time of rapid technological advancement: 'The triple invention of the photograph, cheap methods of graphic reproduction and the celebrity interview in the nineteenth century can be said to have changed authorship forever. [...] With the saturation of newspapers and magazines - the Victorian mass medium - by illustrations, photographs and interviews, Victorian authors had no choice but to consider how best to manage their publicity and promotion, including self-promotion.'³¹³ This thesis later addresses the subject of the reproduction of writers' portraits in illustrated publications, portraits that were usually taken from photographs and then subsequently engraved or lithographed. But now we wish to examine how the painted portraits created by the *Peredvizhniki* in the 1870s and 1880s were discussed in reviews of exhibitions and then how, in the 1880s and 1890s, the exhibitions and galleries themselves evolved.

Newspaper reviews

The *Peredvizhniki* travelling exhibitions were fortunate enough to commence at approximately the same time that newspaper and periodical publishing was expanding in Russia. The wide range of newly established journals such as *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* and *Golos* not only reproduced portraits of writers, but

1909) worked both as an art critic and as a curator at the Hermitage. His son was the painter K.A. Somov.

³¹² R. Hargreaves, 'Putting Faces to the Names: Social and Celebrity Portrait Photography', in P. Hamilton and R. Hargreaves (eds.), *The Beautiful and the Damned. The Creation of Identity in Nineteenth Century Photography*, London, 2001, p. 19, pp. 17-56.

³¹³ L. K. Hughes, 'A Woman Poet Angling for Notice: Rosamund Marriott Watson', in M. Demoor (ed.), *Marketing the Author: Authorial Personae, Narrative Selves and Self-Fashioning, 1880-1930*, Basingstoke, 2004, pp. 134-155, p. 134.

also commented on the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions for their readers, perhaps introducing them for the first time to the world of contemporary Russian art. The role of the newspaper and journal review is fundamental in analysing the reception of representations of writers. By revealing the reactions of critics, published reviews can provide indirect evidence of the reaction of the Russian public to exhibited works of art and exhibitions in general. It is impossible to gauge exactly how much influence reviews had over visitors' reactions to works of art and exhibition attendance but, if judged according to the general impact periodicals had on literate Russian society, it was not inconsiderable. As Robert Belknap remarks: 'They were [...] the chief source of information and attitudes, an arena in which writers and other literate people could learn more and absorb more culture than in any part of Russia's explicit system of education.'³¹⁴ Moreover, Katia Dianina notes in her study of the feuilleton (in which form many exhibition reviews appeared) that 'aside from fulfilling its nominal role of entertaining the general reader [...] the broadly accessible feuilleton functioned in imperial Russia as a guide to popular culture and a forum for public opinion.'³¹⁵

This section looks firstly at the discussion of portraits of writers in reviews of the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions and individual *Peredvizhniki* artists. Secondly, it considers the development of exhibition guides and catalogues and how these contributed to the exhibition visitor's greater understanding of works of art, particularly portraiture; how they expanded the effect exhibitions could have and developed the commercial aspects of art and exhibitions. In reaction to criticism of the reproduction of works of art in the first edition of his illustrated catalogue of the Fine Art Section of the 1882 All-Russian Exhibition, the art impresario, historian and pioneer of Russian art catalogues Nikolai Petrovich Sobko (1851-1906) responded that the critics did not fully appreciate the aims of his catalogue. 'They [critics] did not take into consideration our aims in designing a similar publication [to ones produced abroad] – to give the public the means to remember works at home.'³¹⁶ What will become clear is that the

³¹⁴ R. Belknap, 'Survey of Russian Journals, 1840-1880', in D. Martinsen (ed.), *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 91-116, p. 92.

³¹⁵ Dianina, 'The Feuilleton', p. 188.

³¹⁶ Sobko, 'Predislovie ko 2-mu izdaniu', *Illustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki v Moskve 1882*, St. Petersburg, 1882, pp. I-II.

period 1870 to 1890 witnessed not only the development of Russian art in terms of style and subject matter, but also the development of its presentation in accompanying and responsive texts.

Reviews in newspapers and journals varied, naturally, depending on the nature of the publication. They could appear in the newly established family orientated illustrated weekly journals, ‘thick’ literary journals and the daily newspapers of the two capitals and the major provincial cities. However, it would be wrong to presume that a review that appeared in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* would be less insightful than one that appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski*. The reviews were often shorter in the weekly publications but this sometimes resulted in authors focusing on the pictures and not diverting the reader off on tangents, or trying to prove their own creative abilities through their critical prose. Although illustrated journals wanted to be accessible to as many readers as possible, they also wanted to be considered publications that educated and developed in their readership a greater appreciation of art, literature, culture and science. In the 1890s Anton Chekhov, in a letter to the editor of *Niva* (to which he occasionally contributed), neatly summed up the position of such a journal:

You are right in saying that it is necessary to keep the ‘Motley’ (*pestryi*) reader in view, and you are right to publish *Erisman*, because the Russian motley reader, even if not educated (*obrazovan*), wants to and is striving to become educated; he is serious, thoughtful and not stupid.³¹⁷

This thesis makes use of reviews from a variety of publications; however the availability of sources was not always consistent and some publications were not always accessible or were incomplete. Exhibition reviews in newspapers tended to feature over a number of editions and often went outside the remit of simply commenting on the works of display. The reaction of the public and visitor numbers, particular to the first few *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions, was nearly always commented upon, many critics simply marvelled at the fact that a group of artists had decided to establish such exhibitions:

When some artists two years ago conceived of the unprecedented enterprise – to acquaint, by the means of travelling exhibitions, our

³¹⁷ Chekhov quoted by A. Durkin, ‘Chekhov and the Journals of his Time’, in *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, pp. 228-245, p. 241.

provincial towns with new works of national art, from everywhere rang out supportive voices and predictions of complete success.³¹⁸

The chance for Russians in the provincial cities to see Russian art was particularly applauded, although sometimes, provincial audiences were berated by critics for not fully embracing this momentous opportunity. In 1873 the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition visited Kishinev³¹⁹ and the reaction of the public to the exhibition was as significant to the critic of the *Bessarabian Regional Gazette* (*Bessarabskie oblastnye vedomosti*) as the pictures themselves:

...it was quite anticipated that the Kishinev public, not having been able to see the exhibited pictures, in advance, would form a very positive opinion of them and as soon as an exhibition in Kishinev was announced that they would fill the halls of the male gymnasium (where the exhibition has taken shelter for want of a more spacious location). But, either our public do not trust the opinions of journalists very much, or simply ignore everything, that does not concern their everyday needs – only visits to the exhibition, in spite of the positive merit of the pictures, have been extremely sluggish. The number of visitors from the opening of the exhibition until the present time varies between twenty to fifty persons a day and this from our town of around one hundred thousand inhabitants! God knows, how to explain our society's disinclination for painting!³²⁰

It was not only the inhabitants of Kishinev that were presented as ungrateful by their local journalists. Three years later the *Peredvizhniki* travelled for the first time to Elizavetgrad (since 1939 known as Kirovograd), but only attracted some eight hundred visitors; in Kiev the same exhibition had been seen by over four thousand.³²¹ The small number of visitors caused a journalist for the *Elizavetgrad Herald* (*Elizavetgradskii vestnik*), who had been excitedly promoting the forthcoming show to issue this bitter, but rather insightful remark:

The premature departure of the exhibition from our town is explained by the small number of visitors to it, and therefore it is hardly likely that the exhibition will stop in Elizavetgrad ever again.³²²

³¹⁸ 'N'/A.I. Somov, 'Vtoraia peredvizhnaia vystavka', p.1.

³¹⁹ The exhibition visited Kishinev between 30 September 1873-21 October 1873 and was housed at the Male Gymnasium. *Tpkhv*, vol. II, p. 628.

³²⁰ 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka v Kishineve', *Bessarabskie oblastnye vedomosti*, no. 81, 13 October 1873, p. 394.

³²¹ *Tpkhv*, vol. II, p. 631.

³²² 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Elizavetgradskii vestnik*, no.37, 4 November 1876, p.1.

This rebuff may have had some effect on the art lovers of Elizavetgrad for the *Peredvizhniki* did return in 1882 and on this occasion over two thousand people viewed the works on display.³²³

Authors of reviews could vary as much as the publications their articles appeared in. In the 1870s a few were well known journalists and writers; M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, whose portrait would appear in the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition, reviewed the first exhibition for *Otechestvennye zapiski* as did the most famous of all Russian art critics of the second half of the nineteenth century, V.V. Stasov. Stasov was, along with Tret'iakov, the most significant non-artist figure associated with the *Peredvizhniki*. Although his official career was as a librarian at the Imperial Public Library, St. Petersburg, it did not stop him composing numerous articles promoting the achievements and developments in Russian art, music, archaeology and history. His output as a critic overshadows any of his contemporaries; from 1847 he contributed to more than fifty Russian and foreign periodicals and published more than seven hundred articles on Russian art and music, as well as producing a number of books. Stasov has also left us a vast correspondence with some of the major cultural figures of the time, including Tret'iakov, Repin and Tolstoi. Stasov reviewed the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition for *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*³²⁴ and it is worth beginning this section with a brief analysis of the text, for although its author was an exceptional critic of Russian art, its structure and the way it presents paintings to the reader is similar to that of many reviews of *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions.

Most reviews of the first exhibitions, including Stasov's, discuss the newness of the undertaking and Stasov immediately makes clear to the reader that this exhibition is a significant event, and one they must endeavour to see. 'All this is unheard of and unprecedented, all this is a staggering innovation.' Stasov's first few paragraphs explain to readers how fortunate they are that artists want to involve themselves with the people, 'to create with those paintings and statues something significant and important for the mind and emotions of the people.' Any reader who either is not interested in the

³²³ *Tpkhv*, vol. II, p. 631.

³²⁴ Stasov, 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka 1871',
<http://hri.shef.ac.uk/rva/texts/stasov/stas09/stas09.html>.

exhibition, or has seen it and was not impressed, is made to feel rather unworthy and outcast as Stasov boldly declares that 'the travelling exhibition will soon appear in Moscow, Kiev, Odessa and other towns, and will of course inspire the same gratitude and sympathy everywhere.' Stasov provides a brief overview on the formation of the *Peredvizhniki* and drives home the fact that its members are a new generation of artists, but soon begins with the first painting, N.N. Ge's *Peter I interrogates the tsarevich Aleksei in Perterhof*. One feature common in exhibition reviews was the decision by the author to concentrate on a few pictures. These, unfortunately for our purposes, were rarely portraits. In response to the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition critics, including Stasov and Saltykov-Shchedrin, paid greatest attention to Ge's *Peter I interrogates the tsarevich Aleksei in Perterhof* and Perov's *Hunters at Rest*. In the second exhibition it was Kramskoi's *Christ in the Wilderness (Khristos v pustyne)* (1872) that entranced the critics. Illustrations of the pictures under discussion rarely accompanied reviews, therefore a genre painting or one of a historical or Biblical subject was much easier for the critic to summarize in an interesting way; he could describe the setting, the scene in progress. For example, in the case of *Hunters at Rest*, Stasov amusingly outlines the reactions of two of the hunters to the story of the third:

We think that this hunter-fibber, who tells tales with such passion, with such genuine inspiration, spreading his fingers wide and making his eyes bulge with his wondrous adventures and unprecedented fantastic stories - is the most inventive double of Gogol's Nozdrev; and meanwhile a peasant hunter chuckles to himself, and scratches his ear, virtually saying: 'Aah, mate! Whatever will that bloke come up with next!

This extract from Stasov's piece demonstrates why genre pictures had a constant presence in reviews; they provided critics with so many interesting details with which they could build a story that their job was already half-done. It was easier to form a relationship with the reader, everyone knows a teller of tall tales; portraits, however, even of well known figures were much harder to explain to the reader and to bring to life through the written word. Compared to genre scenes and landscapes (with which Stasov concluded the review) portraiture

received much less attention and it seems that even the mighty Stasov, like other critics, found analysing them much more of a challenge.

Stasov's article is approximately seven thousand words long and appeared over two issues of the newspaper, a week apart, as did many newspaper reviews. Both parts of the review featured on the front and second pages of the newspaper, in the *feuilleton* section. Reviews of the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions usually appeared in the *feuilleton* section of newspapers and this explains the conversational tone of these pieces. Dianina observes that this particular form of journalism 'regularly profiled public displays of all kinds [...] from the Annual Show at the Academy of Fine Arts to an exhibit of trained fleas in the Passage.'³²⁵ The *feuilletonist's* role was one of social critic and public commentator; therefore the attendance of visitors to exhibitions, their behaviour and reaction to the works on display was often as important as the works themselves. Moreover, A.S. Suvorin characterized the purpose of the *feuilleton* as 'to repeat in light form what [the reader] has no time or inclination to read in serious form.'³²⁶ The 'lightness' of these articles also explains the reason why critics often focused on genre scenes or history paintings rather than portraiture; it was much easier to compose lively conversational prose on an amusing genre scene such as Perov's *Hunters at Rest*, than to analysis the representation of psyche and intellect in Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii. In Britain, the situation was much the same and much lamented by 'serious' art critics. The British based artist and commentator James McNeill Whistler (1834-1904) derided the type of art criticism that appeared in *feuilletons* and the type of critic that produced it.

Apart from a few technical terms, for the display of which he finds an occasion, the work is considered absolutely from a literary point of view; indeed from what other can he consider it? And in his essays he deals with it as with a novel – a history – or an anecdote.³²⁷

³²⁵ Dianina, 'The Feuilleton', p. 188.

³²⁶ A.S. Suvorin quoted in McReynolds, *The News Under Russia's Old Regime*, p. 67. Aleksei Sergeevich Suvorin (1834-1912) was one of the most powerful figures in Russian publishing. His Newspaper *Novoe vremia* was the most influential newspaper of its day Russia and Suvorin's publishing house was 'Russia's first publishing empire'.

³²⁷ Whistler quoted in K. Flint, *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination*, Cambridge, 2000, p. 197.

As the reference to Gogol in the quotation from Stasov shows, critics also, quite rightly, presumed their readership would have a shared prior knowledge of certain historical events, episodes from the Bible and works of Russian literature. Prior knowledge of Russian art and artists is not always taken for granted, although in reviews of later *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions this becomes more common, and critics make reference to works shown at previous exhibitions for example.

But how does portraiture fare in Stasov's review? The first work listed in the exhibition's *ukazatel'* was Perov's portrait of A.N. Ostrovskii and also on show was Ge's portrait of Turgenev as well as a number of other non-writer portraits, making ten in total. Initially it seems, Stasov is not keen on portraiture, in reference to Perov's works on display, portraits of A.N. Ostrovskii; a Mr Stepanov; a Miss Timasheva; and two genre scenes *Rybolov (The Fisherman)* and *Hunters at Rest* he states: 'It goes without saying that the latter are far more important to us.' Stasov makes no explicit reference to Ge's portrait of Turgenev, which seems odd as only moments before he makes a reference to the author's *Story of the Nightingales* as the only literary equivalent to *Hunters at Rest* and *The Fisherman*, but merely refers to it along with the portrait of T.P. Kostomarova as 'not bad'. However, he does mention the portrait of Ostrovskii, and in glowing terms: 'the three-quarter-length portrait of Ostrovskii, in a Russian sheepskin, is one of the most perfect works of the Russian school'. Yet Stasov makes no attempt to visualise for the reader the playwright's facial expression or pose. However, as is discussed further on, all the writers painted by *Peredvizhniki* artists in the 1870s and 1880s had already been presented in engravings or photographs, so perhaps we can make our own presumptions about the attitude of critics in presenting portraits of writers in their exhibition reviews. As will be seen in subsequent extracts, critics rarely made basic descriptive statements about well-known portrait subjects; such as 'Ostrovskii is a heavily built individual with a short beard.' Portraits of Ostrovskii were in circulation during the 1860s, he appeared in A.E. Miunster's *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei* (Fig. 64), and therefore critics could assume that their readers would be familiar with Ostrovskii's basic physiognomy. Moreover, there are no accessories or any interesting background scene to assist Stasov in his transmission of the painting, Ostrovskii's dress is the most notable feature of the

portrait and Stasov does emphasize the national element of the work, a crucial matter for the critic. Ostrovskii wears a *Russian* sheepskin, this is a great portrait of the *Russian* school. There can be no doubt in the reader's mind that this portrait, both in subject and execution, is representative Russian achievement in both art and literature.

Stasov pays more attention to Kramskoi, predicting that readers will already be asking 'what about Kramskoi?' and it seems for Stasov that the painter is as important as the subject. He does briefly describe Kramskoi's portraits but once again chooses to devote most space to a picture based on a tale by Gogol, known as either *Rusalki (The Water Nymphs)* or, *Maiskaia Noch. Iz Gogol'a (May Night. From Gogol)* (1871). This picture provides many avenues for the critic to explore – the original story, the strange green-yellow colouring, and the sadness of the nymphs. Stasov concludes his piece with comments on more genre scenes and some landscapes, but the tone of the final paragraph, reiterates that of the first. It addresses the reader and their response to this newly accessible Russian art. Stasov first makes certain that anyone who decided not to visit the exhibition or has not yet been, must go, or else risk being out of step with the rest of society: 'We do not doubt that many thousands of people will visit this present exhibition'. The final sentence reassures the reader that they, having read Stasov's piece and, of course, either having visited the exhibition or being about to do so, truly appreciate contemporary Russian art and wholeheartedly support it, thus: 'It would seem that for artists nowadays to complain about their public is simply a sin.'

Stasov's article appeared in one of St. Petersburg's most popular daily newspapers. Saltykov-Shchedrin's review, on the other hand, appeared in a monthly 'thick' journal in which essays of a more intellectual nature were printed. However, there are similarities between the two. Stretching over nine pages, Shchedrin begins by celebrating this event, particularly what it means for those living outside of the capitals: 'This present year marks a most wonderful event for Russian art: some Moscow and Petersburg artists have formed a society with the aim of staging travelling art exhibitions in all Russian towns.'³²⁸

³²⁸ Saltykov-Shchedrin, 'Pervaia russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', p. 268.

Like Stasov, Shchedrin also concentrates on Ge's Peter and Aleksei picture, indeed he devotes three pages to it, ending with the congratulatory affirmation that 'On the whole, Ge's picture makes an enormous impression, and the public constantly surround it.'³²⁹ Shchedrin briefly discusses paintings by Prianishnikov, Miasoedov, Kramskoi and Perov. Unlike Stasov, Shchedrin did not feel the need to engage his reader with amusing or picturesque genre scenes, perhaps reflecting the more serious tastes of the *Otechestvennye zapiski* audience. Moreover, Shchedrin was one of the few critics to dislike *Hunters at Rest*, declaring that although 'taken separately, each figure in this picture is the height of perfection, as a whole, they fail to produce a good impression'.³³⁰ Finally, in the very last paragraph he addresses portraiture:

There are several very good portraits and landscapes. Of the portraits, attention should be paid to the portrait of the writer Ostrovskii, by Perov and to the portrait of Mr Shiff by Ge, [...] As for the other portraits and landscapes, as I am not a specialist, I will pass over them in silence.³³¹

Shchedrin, who was confident enough to enter into lengthy discussions on Ge's *The Last Supper* and *Peter I and Aleksei* felt unable to engage with the portraits on display, even though he produced such lively literary portraits in stories such as *The Golovlyov Family*. Portraiture was a difficult topic for critics to address, to communicate to their readers, and this has proved a challenge when researching the reception to portraiture. If Stasov and Shchedrin felt overwhelmed by the subject of portraiture – how did lesser critics present the portraits on display to their readership?

Some reviews were incredibly sparse in their comments, *Petersburgskii listok* simply stated 'of the portraits on display one's attention rests on the portraits of A.N. Ostrovskii and I.S. Turgenev, the first is made by V.G. Perov, the second by N.N. Ge.'³³² Why one's attention was drawn to these portraits and not the others was not elaborated on, perhaps it was enough that these portraits depicted well-known persons. *Stock Exchange News (Birzhevye vedomosti)* was equally brief, but more enigmatic in its observation that 'in the

³²⁹ Saltykov-Shchedrin, 'Pervaia russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', p. 275.

³³⁰ Saltykov-Shchedrin, 'Pervaia russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', p. 276.

³³¹ Ibid.

³³² 'L', 'Pervaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 239, 4 December 1871, p. 2.

portraits of Mr Perov there is life; they go beyond depicting mere type.’³³³ *The Deed (Delo)* also praised the work of Perov and exclaimed that the ‘Besides these two novelties, [*Hunters at Rest* and *Fisherman*] Mr Perov exhibits three portraits, of which especially good, as regards likeness [...] is the portrait of our dramatist A.N. Ostrovskii.’³³⁴ The critic does not comment on Ostrovskii’s national dress, but does imply, through his use of *nashego dramaturga*, Ostrovskii’s position as a *Russian* writer and a representative of a community of theatre-goers and readers. *Niva*’s feuilletonist similarly described the portrait. ‘The portraits in the present exhibition are also commendable: first place occupied by the portrait of our well known dramatic writer Mr Ostrovskii, made by Mr Perov.’³³⁵ *Delo*’s critic compliments Perov for achieving a good ‘likeness’ of Ostrovskii, but in the next paragraph meditates on what makes a successful portrait. He appears to hold similar feelings as the *Birzhevye vedomosti* critic for whom Perov, a successful portraitist, did more than depict a likeness or ‘type’. Similarly, for the *Delo* critic, ‘likeness’ is not everything. ‘Although in the exhibition there are some satisfactory portraits and “studies of heads”, we would not linger at any one of them. In our opinion, a good portraitist must strike not only a likeness [...] but with intelligence make from “a study of a head” a picture “of substance”’.³³⁶ The two critics both attempted to explain to readers what elements, in their opinion, were necessary for the execution of an effective and successful portrait and they, along with the other critics were much taken with Perov’s portrait of Ostrovskii. The *Moscow Gazette (Moskovskie vedomosti)* also attempted to outline to readers why they recommended in particular Perov’s portraits and in doing so, raised the subject of the plain and dark background of the majority of *Peredvizhniki* portraits, an area which most critics overlooked.

The portraits of Perov reveal the work not of a craftsman or artisan, but of an artist. In their depiction of characteristics, they capture the essential features of the originals; they attract the viewer’s attention; they provide the character of the person they represent; incidental items and

³³³ Staryi znakomyi, ‘Petersburgskii listok – Vystavka kartin v Akademii Khudozhestv’, *Birzhevye vedomosti*, 5 December 1871.

³³⁴ Khudozhnik-liubitel’, ‘Na svoikh nogakh. (Po povodu pervoi khudozhestvennoi vystavki Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh vystavok)’, *Delo*, 1871, pp. 106-118, p. 114.

³³⁵ ‘Feleton: Peredvizhnaia vystavka’, *Niva*, no. 51, 20 December 1871, pp. 818-819, p. 819.

³³⁶ Khudozhnik-liubitel’, ‘Na svoikh nogakh’, p. 114.

accessories are moved aside in the background and so do not divert attention.³³⁷

However, no portrait in any *Peredvizhniki* exhibition was universally liked and it was *Golos* that in 1871 was quite literally the voice of dissent.

With regards to the portraits of Mr Perov, they leave much to be desired. Concerning their 'likeness' it could be called fair, but there is something unpleasant about their brightness and the 'wide brushstrokes', the frequently poor painting much impedes the artistic aims; this is especially noticeable in the portrait of Mr Ostrovskii. The portraits painted by Mr Ge, also do not stand out with merit.³³⁸

In the reviews of the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition portraiture did not receive a large amount of attention; genre and history pictures and the very occasion of the exhibition itself were the focus. However, these reviews should not be disregarded as they brought portraits of writers into the arena of public discussion, debate and opinion – people were made aware of the portraits existence and the fact that they were on show. The second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition contained a large number of portraits of writers, but even here not all reviews mentioned all of the portraits.

Sometimes it seems as if the critics blamed the readers for their own neglect of portraiture in their reviews. Commenting on the second exhibition, which included portraits of Dostoevskii, Maikov, Turgenev, Saltykov-Shchedrin and Nekrasov, A.I. Somov, writing for the *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* states:

In general, this exhibition is abundant with portraits; they total twelve, that is, 25% of the entire number of works on display. This proportion of exhibition content will hardly please the general public, whose gaze in exhibitions rests chiefly upon entertaining scenes and beautiful landscapes.³³⁹

Perhaps Somov had a point. Whereas 11,515 people visited the first exhibition in Petersburg, only 6,322 visited the second, although in Kiev, attendance to the second exhibition increased from 2,831 to 5,139. If we consider the review in general, it presents a mixed opinion of the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition overall, not just the proportion of portraits. It criticizes the size of the exhibition

³³⁷ L. A-ov, 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka v Moskve', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 137 2 June 1872, p. 3.

³³⁸ 'Peterburgskaia khronika', *Golos*, no. 332, 1 December 1871, p. 2.

³³⁹ A.I. Somov, 'Vtoraia peredvizhnaia vystavka', p.1.

inventory (*ukazatel'*) as 'minute' (*Kroshechenyi*) and compares the show both favourably and unfavourably to the previous *Peredvizhniki* exhibition.

Of course, there is nothing in it to match those works exhibited last year, the picture by Ge of *Peter I and Aleksei* and Perov's *Hunters at Rest*, but at the same time there are considerably fewer knick knacks, which one came across in last year's exhibition. There is more regular artistic merit exhibited in the works today, than there was the time before.

Although Somov believed no work matched those of Ge and Perov, he devotes considerable space to Kramskoi's *Christ in the Wilderness*; a work that attracted the critics' attention in the manner *Peter I* and *Hunters at Rest* had the year before. Continuing on from the prediction that the public will not be pleased with the proportion of portraits, Somov does then go on to praise those portraits that are on show:

As if intentionally arranged, Ge and Perov have exhibited an entire series of portraits of Russian men of letters. To the former belong portraits of Nekrasov and Saltykov [...] and are splendid likenesses, but perhaps one could wish for more precision. As regards Perov, then the best, even impeccably good of all his portraits that have been sent, should be identified as the portrait of Dostoevskii: the freedom of the figure's placement, the successful capturing of expression and the skilful modelling of the face are combined here with a naturalness and freshness of colour, these are important conditions in any painting, but especially so in portrait painting, and not always evident in Perov. His portrait of Mr Pogodin, is remarkable not only in execution, but in the accomplishment with which the artist comprehends the character of the Moscow writer, surrounding his old man's person with a suitable setting: no other costume besides this patriarchal dressing gown worn unfastened, no other accessories, besides this walking stick which looks as though it had been taken from some museum, no other seat, apart from this armchair would have corresponded so well with the image which you take away of this writer from Perov's work. The other works by Perov are the portraits of the late Dal', Maikov and Turgenev and are in no way distinguished from his other works of portraiture and, at the same time as they preserve their merits, they also share their usual fault -- an unpleasant and unnatural reddish tint. Perov presents yet another portrait, not of a man of letters, but of an ordinary mortal. The portrait is of Kamynin, an elderly person with a medal around his neck and with a characterful physiognomy, very suitable for portraiture. This portrait is also a great success, but all the same, less than the portrait of Dostoevskii.

In examining reviews of the second exhibition, Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii dominates all comments and observations on the portraiture displayed; it was

one of the few portraits that rivalled genre or historical pictures in the coverage it gained in newspapers and journals. It demonstrates that a portrait could capture the attention and imagination of critics and this remained the case for the rest of the nineteenth century. After the portrait was shown at the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition it was included in the St. Petersburg exhibition of works selected as Russian entries to the 1878 World Exhibition, Paris, it was then of course shown at Paris.³⁴⁰ Four years later it was in the 1882 All-Russian Exhibition, Moscow, and in Moscow and St. Petersburg at the Posthumous Exhibition of the works of V.G. Perov, 1882-83. During this time it was also on display in its original intended location, the gallery of Pavel and Sergei Tret'iakov.

Critical reviews of portraits can be frustratingly short; and this poses a challenge to the assessment of the reception of portraits of writers (or any portraits for that matter). As we have observed, critics preferred discussing genre scenes and history paintings, a fact they often justified as reflecting the tastes of the public. It was not only Somov that proposed this opinion, the anonymous reviewer of the *Illustrated Gazette* (*Illustrirovannaia gazeta*) almost implies that *he* would love to write about the portraits of writers in the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition but was unable to, owing to the demands of his readership.

...Ge also presented two portraits. Of course, the personalities of Nekrasov, Saltykov and Turgenev are very interesting and, what is more, superbly executed, but the public prefers in exhibitions pictures with striking subjects, and even flock round landscapes.³⁴¹

The neglect by the press of certain works of art exhibited by the *Peredvizhniki* is reflected in a piece from the *Kievlianin* in which its author, A. Shkliarevskii, did not criticize the tastes of the public, but the practises of his own profession.

It seems to me that the press up until now has not shown the enterprise of the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions the support which it deserves. This support, of course, must not consist in advertisements, the benefit of which is always quite ambiguous, but in seriously analysing at least those works, which have a doubtless right to general attention. This would be the best

³⁴⁰ *Catalogue de la Section russe à L'Exposition universelle de Paris, Paris, 1878. Vystavka khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii, naznachennykh dlia Parizhskoi Vsemirnoi vystavki 1878 goda, St. Petersburg, 1878.*

³⁴¹ 'Peterburgskaia pis'ma', *Illustrirovannaia gazeta*, no. 7, 15 February 1873, p. 11.

means to raise still more the popularity of the exhibitions and, consequently, to increase all the more the benefit that they bring. There is no doubt that that our press has done very little so far in that respect. Sometimes artistically very important pieces travel the whole of Russia with these exhibitions without the press saying one serious word about them. Of course, for the large majority of people, even perfectly ignorant of art, a really good picture, without all sorts of explanations from every side, arouses that special inner feeling, which we characterize with the phrase 'I like it'. Artists know, that the majority of the public, or as they are sometimes called *the crowd*, are able at times to form a quite accurate judgement about the most sublime works of art.³⁴²

Shkliarevskii's observation that pictures could tour the Russian Empire 'without the press saying one serious word about them' could be applied to the treatment of *Peredvizhniki* portrait painting in many cases. Portraits were often mentioned at the end of an article, in the concluding paragraphs. Moreover, portraits and paintings that one might expect to attract the attention of reviewers are not mentioned at all or are acknowledged as being simply 'excellent' or 'very good'. For example, the critic 'P-nnii', in describing the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition for readers of *Moskovskie vedomosti*³⁴³ sums up the portrait section in a few lines.

The portraits in the exhibition [...] all are famous literary figures: Ge presented portraits of Nekrasov and Saltykov and Perov a portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii. All three portraits are excellent likenesses, but for technical skill Mr Perov's work deserves most recognition.³⁴⁴

This simple statement might indicate one of the reasons why the *Moskovskie vedomosti* critic felt he did not have to expand further on these portraits. They were of 'famous literary figures' and 'excellent likeness' – why discuss a portrait if it is of someone well known and it looks like them? Or, at least looks like other representations of them in the public sphere. The particular praise for Perov and his portrait of Dostoevskii implies there is something special about this work, but this critic was perhaps as Whistler highlighted, unable to

³⁴² A. Shkliarevskii, *Ocherki tret'ei peredvizhnikovoi vystavki*, Kiev, 1875, p. 2. This is a 52 page leaflet that collected together reviews of the third *Peredvizhniki* exhibition published in the *Kievlianin* nos. 37, 39, 40 & 41, 1875.

³⁴³ The second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition was not exhibited in Moscow as part of the 1872-1873 tour. Instead works from it joined with the third exhibition held in Moscow 2 April 1874-31 May 1874, housed in the Moscow School of Painting, Architecture and Sculpture.

³⁴⁴ P-nnii, 'Tret'ia peredvizhnaia vystavka v Moskve; *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 139, 4 June 1874, p. 3.

communicate with his readers about the portrait – it was simply too much a test for his analytical and journalistic ability. This situation is repeated elsewhere. ‘Tolokonnikov’ writing in the *Contemporary News (Sovremennye izvestiia)* observed for his readers.

In the exhibition there are several portraits, superb in all respects. Ge has two Portraits: Shchedrin (Saltykov) and Nekrasov; works by Perov are a portrait of Dostoevskii and some gentleman in a velvet overcoat that I don’t recognize.³⁴⁵

Provincial newspapers reported in a similar fashion. The *Riga Herald (Rizhskii vestnik)*, after spending some time discussing Ge’s picture of Peter the Great and his son from the previous exhibition comments that in the present one ‘there are some portraits by Ge: a portrait of Nekrasov and a portrait of Saltykov (Shchedrin). Admittedly, these portraits are painted very well, of that there is no doubt, by in my opinion, as pictures, they cede to the portraits painted by Perov.’³⁴⁶ This review also contained the complaints of another provincial journalist about exhibition attendance and again it was his readers he targeted. ‘In my opinion the Society should not be embarrassed by the poor number of visitors to it, it is to the shame of the inhabitants of Riga.’³⁴⁷

However it would be wrong to give the impression that all critics ignored portraiture or were unable to engage with it. Following Saltykov-Shchedrin’s review of the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition for *Otechestvennye zapiski*, Pavel Mikhailovich Kovalevskii (1823-1907)³⁴⁸ composed a review of the second exhibition for the journal. Kovalevskii, like Shchedrin, was a writer of literary works as well as journalism, which perhaps explains why he paid attention to the portraits of writers. In the following extract Kovalevskii refers to Perov’s portraits of the historian Pogodin, Dostoevskii, Turgenev, Maikov, Dal’, the merchant Kamynin and Ge’s portraits of Nekrasov and Saltykov-Shchedrin.

³⁴⁵ Tolokonnikov, ‘Peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin’, *Sovremennye izvestiia* no. 104, 9 May 1874, p. 2.

³⁴⁶ ‘Russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka v Rige’, *Rizhskii vestnik*, no. 74, 2 April 1873, p. 2.

³⁴⁷ ‘Russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka v Rige’, *Rizhskii vestnik*, no. 76, 4 April 1873, p. 2.

³⁴⁸ P.M. Kovalevskii was one of the first professional art critics of the 1850s and 1860s and was particularly concerned with the issue of a ‘Russian’ school of painting. Some of his best articles appeared in *Otechestvennye zapiski*, V.V. Vanslov, *Russkaia progressivnaia khudozhestvennaia kritika vtoroi poloviny XIX-nachala XX veka*, Moscow, 1977, pp.39-41.

However, one can see not only a wonderful historian³⁴⁹ [...] but also some other famous faces. Who, thanks to the beneficial project of our artists, will be faces that travel around Russia. The portraits of famous native writers created by the best artists - of which, if we are not mistaken, Mr Ge has provided an example – are a very desirable illustration to their works, especially when these portraits are so intelligent and similar to the originals, such as the portraits of Nekrasov and Saltykov, by Ge, and the portrait of Dostoevskii, painted by Perov. This portrait is also a picture. Such fresh, soft and delicate painting, with a striking likeness and a depth of truth in the transmission of character, not only of the personal but also of the literary, which up till now we have not met in Perov, and what is more in general we find rarely in our portraitists. The author of the 'House of the Dead' sits, hands gripped around knees, immersed in hopelessly sorrowful thoughts...Up until now we have been familiar only with the work of Mr Ge, which, unfortunately, has not appeared in exhibitions – in the same way, if not more powerful and expressive, exciting, beating with life and inspiration. This is such a portrait, but a portrait, worth an entire picture! Indeed, portrait painting, when it is undertaken by a true talent, sometimes succeeds in dissolving its tight boundaries. You know that in literature, too, lively and accurate descriptions of individual personalities form the subject of works of belles lettres. Only dry, faded and external prints and copies, both in art and in literature, remain copies, the equivalents of photographs and official records. If Perov only painted one portrait like the Dostoevskii, that would be sufficient to have him recognized as a true artist; but he has painted no less skilfully, and perfectly other portraits, with quite different methods. Yet another outstanding portrait is of a stout old fashioned merchant with a medal around his neck – how the paintbrush [Perov] has competed with the pen of Ostrovskii, and, one must do justice to the brush: Kit Kitch emerges from his encounter with it [the brush] in all his full glory. This is a realistic, bold, expansive painting, which makes a bold impression with its colouring and oils- a striking contrast to that delicate shading and faded colouring, which in its own way is so effective in the portrait of Dostoevskii.

The collection of famous names is supplemented at the exhibition by the portraits of Turgenev, Maikov, and Dal'; but if they add anything to Mr Perov's reputation it is from the other side of the coin – they are so flat, lifeless, dry – simply quite awful portraits. They should not even be exhibited here, still less sent to tour the provinces!

Even Turgenev's facial features do not escape, but have been painted exactly as if cast from iron! Maikov looks like he has been cast from some kind of asphalt and Dal' – wax! Variety, as can be seen, has been observed, but all other requirements have been violated.³⁵⁰

³⁴⁹ A reference to Perov's portrait of the historian M.P. Pogodin.

³⁵⁰ Kovalevskii, 'Vtoraia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin russkikh khudozhnikov', p. 94.

This is a lengthy quotation but one that deserves to be reproduced in full as it raises some fundamental issues concerning portraits of writers. Kovalevskii provides a mixed review of the portraits on show and is not afraid to be harshly critical when he feels necessary; it is not a slur on the subjects, but the way they were, in his opinion, badly presented. Kovalevskii was probably personally acquainted with a number of the writers depicted and so would have felt he had a right to state that they seem to have been modelled out of building materials. Yet he does not take an overtly personal approach in his piece, but in reviewing the portraits, writes in an inclusive manner that draws the reader in. These are 'famous native writers' and he presents the portrait of Dostoevskii, at least, as evidence of the prowess of both Russian painting and Russian literature; the Russian viewer should be proud as these are examples of national creative excellence, these are 'our artists' painting 'native writers'. Here we see Russian literature and art combined together as evidence of national cultural achievement. A portrait of a Russian writer by a Russian painter was put on display for a Russian audience. Moreover, not only one portrait of a writer, but in the case of the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition a number of writers were on display and as a collective would have made a greater impression of the vitality of Russian literature. Indeed, the fact that this collection of portraits of Russian writers and intellectuals were shown at the second exhibition but the organizers failed to hang them together, was brought up by *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* and demonstrates that insightful observations were not the sole preserve of 'thick' journals.

Perov has now risen to the greatest height in portraiture with his representation of F.M. Dostoevskii – the work is in all parts capital. The portrait of A.N. Maikov, is full of life and especially animated, and ought to be exhibited next to Dostoevskii. Turgenev the same and (especially) Pogodin – who is hung at the edge of the exhibition - all should be shown together.³⁵¹

³⁵¹ 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka v Akademii Khudozhestv', *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 211, 13 January 1873, p. 51. The portraits would not be hung together in the Tret'iakov Gallery either where works were located in halls according to artist and then hung together in a manner which appears disorganized to the present eye. Botkina, *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov* reproduces a photograph of the Perov hall taken in 1898. (Fig. 47) It shows that the portraits of Pogodin and Dostoevskii were hung just below eye level, separated by the genre painting *The Birdcatchers*. Further to the right and a foot higher hung the portrait of Kamynin and then to the left of this going upwards on a diagonal hung Dal' followed by Maikov. All Perov's major genre paintings surrounded the portraits.

Therefore, you have a community of Russian people, the exhibition visitors, viewing a community of Russian writers. Yet, even if you were unable to attend one of the exhibitions you could still be part of this community through reading about the event in journals or, as was the case in later years, gaining an impression of the exhibition through its reproduction in illustrated journals. Illustrated journals brought the experience of the exhibition to their readers and often created exhibition scenes in their pages. *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* featured drawings of exhibitions and their visitors, not only bringing the art to their readership but the exhibition experience as well; it showed readers how people dressed and behaved at an exhibition. As early as 1879 two drawings of visitors to the halls of the Society for the Encouragement of Art, St. Petersburg were reproduced on a whole page (Fig. 48).³⁵² More interesting was a two-page spread of the fourteenth *Peredvizhniki* exhibition presented in a sophisticated composition that placed paintings at a variety of angles along with sketches of exhibition visitors (Fig. 49).³⁵³ These illustrations support the point this thesis makes; that art became more accessible as a result of the development of both print and exhibition culture.

In the case of the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition one can expand even further on the role of exhibitions in the formation of a national public identity. Most of the writer portraits were ordered and purchased by Tret'iakov, a fact that was acknowledged in the exhibition *ukazatel'*.³⁵⁴ This further reinforced the point about the strength of Russian achievement, in this case an example of the success of a Russian businessman, a representative of the ever growing middle group in Russia.

Kovalevskii does focus attention on the techniques used in the creation of the portraits, contrasting Perov's portrait of the merchant Kamynin 'bold, expansive, painting' with the 'delicate shading and faded colouring' evident in the portrait of Dostoevskii. Although Kovalevskii discusses the way in which the portraits are painted, he does not really describe the portraits themselves –

³⁵² *Vsemirnaia Illiustratsiia*, 2 June 1879.

³⁵³ *Vsemirnaia Illiustratsiia*, 10 May 1886, pp. 388-389.

³⁵⁴ In the *Peredvizhniki* exhibition's *ukazatel'* ownership of works was acknowledged. For example after the entry of Perov's portrait of Ostrovskii it states in brackets '*sobstvennost' P.M. Tret'iakova*'. *Ukazatel' pervoi khudozhestvennoi vystavki tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh vystavki 1871 goda*. Reproduced in *Tpkhv*, vol. I, p. 61.

how the subjects are positioned for example, except in the case of Dostoevskii to refer to the writer's gripped hands. Instead, Kovalevskii's critique is, for the most part, more sophisticated than a mere description of pictures. These are portraits of writers and Kovalevskii raises the issue of literature and its parallels in painting; that with both, true talent manages to create not copies of originals but entities that exist in their own right 'beating with life and inspiration' that dissolve the tight boundaries of painting. Although Kovalevskii argues Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii exists effectively in isolation, he does begin the section with the statement that the portraits of Nekrasov and Saltykov are 'intelligent and similar to the originals'. One will often come across reference to a portrait, if deemed successful by a critic, being a 'good likeness' or 'similar to the original', and this implies that the readers already knew or had an idea of what the writers looked like. All the writers Kovalevskii refers to he considers well known – 'famous faces' or 'famous names'. Critics did not need to explain who the writers were, or what their basic physiognomy was, as it was assumed readers already knew. The fact that Kovalevskii describes them as 'famous faces' - a phrase today we associate more with actors and pop stars - underlies the celebrity status these individuals had in Russian society. A review may question the way in which a portrait was painted, how the subject was positioned, but no review ever questioned the fact that these writers were worthy of having their portraits painted and placed on public display, quite the opposite - it was seen as a natural occurrence/undertaking for someone of their position. The celebrity of these writers also partly explains why, when critics disliked a portrait, they were so explicit in their criticism. These were not private portraits of an unknown man or woman, these were portraits of famous men in the public eye and therefore it was paramount that they were represented in a way the critics felt proper; a high standard of painting, a 'striking likeness' and what Kovalevskii terms 'that depth of truth'. If the portraits were poor representations then the critics felt they must protest and warn their readers and potential exhibition visitors, lest they presume that this was how Turgenev, or whoever, really was. This is why, it would seem, why critics only elaborated on portraits if they were exceptional, such as the Dostoevskii portrait, or bad. The former deserved praise, but the latter had to receive attention in order that viewers did not get the wrong impression about a writer. If a portrait was considered neither

particularly bad nor particularly good it seems to have been ignored or merely mentioned in a list of the exhibits.

This was the case with Kramskoi's portrait of Saltykov-Shchedrin, included in the seventh *Peredvizhniki* Exhibition in 1879. Although the painter had fretted over the work for two years before declaring it complete, none of the critics seemed to feel it worthy of praise or rebuke. *Moskovskie vedomosti* mentioned Kramskoi's portrait of E.A. Lavroskaia but nothing about Saltykov.³⁵⁵ *Golos* declared to its readers that in the seventh exhibition

The portrait section is very rich, first place as always, belongs to Mr Kramskoi, who exhibits a whole row of outstanding portraits. As is well known, Mr Kramskoi sets out to convey on canvas not only the outer features of the face, but the whole internal universal soul of the person.³⁵⁶

Surely then, the *Golos* critic went onto discuss Saltykov's portrait? But, no! He made reference to Kramskoi's portrait of the painter A.D. Litovchenko, the portrait of Lavroskaia and a portrait of an unnamed woman in a black dress. The critic of the *Peterburgskii listok* also praised Kramskoi's ability as a portrait painter 'it is possible to see in each portrait the inherent tone of the face'³⁵⁷ but no particular reference is made to Shchedrin. Even *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* excluded Saltykov from its review and concentrated on the portrait of Lavroskaia.³⁵⁸ If the reviews of the seventh exhibition focused their praise on this latter work, once the exhibition reached Moscow, the critics of this capital found a new portrait deserving of comment. In Moscow, a portrait of Turgenev by I.E. Repin joined the exhibition. Repin had first painted Turgenev in 1874, a work that was deemed by all to be unsuccessful. In August 1878 Repin began to paint another portrait of the writer which when it was exhibited, was again declared not to be a success. The lack of attention Saltykov received does not mean critics disapproved of the work, if they had, they would have made it quite clear in their reviews. This can be seen by the piece written by 'Skromnyi

³⁵⁵ 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 95, 16 April 1879, p. 3.

³⁵⁶ Em. 'Khudozhestvennaia khronika', *Golos*, no. 88, 29 March 1879, pp. 1-2, p. 2.

³⁵⁷ 'Vystavka kartin Obshchestva peredvizhnykh vystavok', *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 46, 7 March 1879, p. 2.

³⁵⁸ Khud. A.D., '7-ia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*, no. 89, 31 March 1879, pp. 1-2, p. 2.

nabliudatel' for *Russian Gazette* (*Russkie vedomosti*) which refers to both the Shchedrin and Turgenev portraits.

Of the portraits in the present exhibition the best include those painted by Mr Kramskoi, who exhibits portraits of Prince A.I. Vasil'chikov and M.E. Saltykov. The portrait of Turgenev painted by Repin one finds to be extremely unsuccessful, although the mighty head of our venerable belle-letterist presents the artist with a rich subject. But thanks to Repin Mr Turgenev appears with such a colourful face, that he looks like a man who has been on the drink; both Turgenev's luxurious grey hair and whiskers Repin embellishes with white brushstrokes, so that it reminds one of whipped cream, rather than human hair. Even the likeness is very poor. Any photograph would give a greater understanding of the appearance of Mr Turgenev than the portrait shown by Mr Repin.³⁵⁹

It would be fair to say that if the critics had felt Kramskoi had made errors with his representation of Saltykov, they would have made this quite clear.³⁶⁰ Repin's portrait was only mentioned in reviews because critics felt so strongly about the way the writer was (mis)represented, in the above case, as a bit of a drinker, rather than a venerable bellelettrist. By presenting the aristocratic, European Turgenev with a ruddy face, Repin has not shown his subject the respect he was due. For some critics the reverence with which artists approached their subjects seems to have been of the utmost importance. It did not matter how the subjects' personal, professional or national identities were presented, but that the writers were represented to their public with dignity. Indeed, many critics would rather have an unimaginative portrait than one that tried to express something of the subject's personality if it was not deemed fitting. One portrait which did try to present the subject's personal identity rather than professional was I.N. Kramskoi's portrait of Maikov shown at the twelfth *Peredvizhniki* exhibition in 1884 (Fig. 32).

This portrait was discussed earlier in relation to Tret'iakov's reluctance to purchase the work and its unusual depiction of the poet fishing on a small boat. This was an unique representation of the writer, the antithesis of Perov's

³⁵⁹ Skromnyi nabliudatel', 'Sed'maia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin', *Russkie vedomosti*, no. 92, 15 April 1879, pp. 1-2, p. 2.

³⁶⁰ It would appear that Kramskoi's portrait was a good likeness. The writer's wife commented favourably about it in 1877 and in 1881 an acquaintance of the Saltykov's, E.S. Nekrasova, observed that Saltykov 'is very similar to his portrait made by Kramskoi, although he looks somewhat older, more greying and wrinkled about the face.' *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v vospominaniakh sovremennikov v dvukh tomakh*, vol. I, Moscow, 1975, p. 284.

1872 portrait. In Kramskoi's portrait Maikov is shown full length, outside, and engaged in an activity that had less to do with Maikov's profession (unlike Perov's which showed him holding a book) and more to do with Maikov's personal identity – his pastime of fishing. There was some link between Maikov's poetry and Kramskoi's portrait. Gol'dshtein provides the accompanying note to the letters between Kramskoi and Tret'iakov that discussed the work.

It is known that he was a passionate fisherman. Amongst his works is a poem under the title *Fishing (Rybnaia lovlia)* with the following dedication: 'Dedicated to S.T. Aksakov, N.A. Maikov, A.N. Ostrovskii, I.A. Goncharov, S.S. Dudyskin, A.I. Khalanskii and all that remember this pastime'. This served as a foundation for the idea, that some contemporaries of Maikov saw in the portrait created by Kramskoi, an ironic interpretation of the image of the poet.³⁶¹

The critic of *Russkaia mysl'* was one who enthused over the portrait:

...The portrait of Maikov is the summit of perfection; this is not a portrait even, but a genuine picture of Maikov presented fishing from a boat. True, one could make some remarks about the boat, for example. But the portrait itself is delightful.³⁶²

Moskovskie vedomosti also found problems with the depiction of the boat and due to the 'unusual nature' of Maikov's portrait went to great lengths than normal in describing the appearance of the poet.

Kramskoi exhibits portraits of Denier and Apollon Maikov, of which Maikov is presented standing in a boat amongst the reeds and fishing. The figure of the poet surrounded by marsh, in boots, raincoat, hat, and with arms extended, from one he holds a fishing rod and the other he holds out for balance, in expectation that how there will be 'a bite' – is unusual in nature. The physiognomy is quite similar, although somewhat youthful and the eyes are indefinitely directed (they do not follow the fishing line). The presented situation is also not completely successful and the boat is in particular painted badly.³⁶³

Maikov the fisherman, rather than the writer, is a role that is expanded on in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*. Perhaps the critic felt greater ease in discussing with his

³⁶¹ S.N. Gol'dshtein, note to letter 318, *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, p. 432.

³⁶² Anon., 'XII peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin', p. 83.

³⁶³ M. Solov'ev, 'Dvenadsataia peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 88, 28 March 1884.

readers the activity of fishing, after all, he could be certain that more of his readers would have shared the pleasure of fishing or hunting, than composing a poem. That the critic uses such a strong word 'blissful' (*blazhennyi*), to describe the moment when the fisherman makes a catch, makes one presume he was a fishing aficionado himself.

...the portrait of our well known poet and passionate fisherman, A.N. Maikov, is presented by the artist in one of the most blissful moments, which is whilst occupied in fishing; the poet is in the reeds – entranced – and he has 'a bite'...In the face and in the pose of the poet can be seen the lively expression of the enthusiastic hunter.³⁶⁴

This section has in no way offered a comprehensive collection of all reviews of all writer portraits shown at the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions in the 1870s and 1880s but it has attempted to demonstrate the types of reviews that the Russian reading public were exposed to from a variety of publications. Portraiture was rarely discussed at length in a review; it did not offer itself up to the critic as an easy or lightweight subject in the way an amusing or dramatic genre scene did. Nevertheless, portraits of well-known writers were usually mentioned in articles, even if it was only to state the portrait was 'good' or 'fair'. This in itself is significant; by merely referring to a portrait, critics made their readership aware of the work's existence, they placed them into the public arena. It also shows us that in many cases critics presumed a shared knowledge amongst their readers of the physical appearance of the most famous Russian writers. These reviews demonstrate the considerable level of celebrity these writers had achieved, to the extent that they were almost considered public property. They were constantly referred to as *our* writers; critics and readers knew that these writers belonged to them, the Russian reading public. With notable exceptions, critics rarely went into deep analysis of the representation of the writers; they placed strong emphasis on the production of a 'good likeness' and were often sharp in their comments if they felt the writer had failed on this count. However, for a critic an unsatisfactory representation was not necessarily a bad thing; it was far easier to produce an entertaining and humorous piece of journalism whilst criticizing Turgenev's 'whipped cream' hair and rosy face than it was

³⁶⁴ Malenkii khudozhnik, 'XII vystavka tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh vystavok', *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 10, 10 March 1884, p. 154.

whilst praising Kramskoi's depiction of the physical and intellectual torment of Saltykov-Shchedrin.

Critical reviews provided the Russian reading public with an impression of an exhibition they may or may not actually go to see; it widened the exhibition experience and expanded the scope of visual culture further, taking into the home. Exhibition culture continued to develop in the 1880s and one element of this that again could widen the exhibition experience was the formation of the exhibition guidebook.

Exhibition Guides

If the 1870s saw the beginning of a new era of visual culture in Russia - from *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions to the establishment of illustrated journals - then the 1880s saw the new become the established, and the continual development and diversification of the Russian art world and all associated with it. The *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions continued annually and the Society grew in membership, V.I. Surikov joined in 1881, A.M. Vasnetsov in 1886; it visited more provincial cities, Warsaw in 1883 and Poltava in 1888; and visitor numbers grew, the first exhibition attracted a total of 29, 503 visitors, the ninth exhibition in 1881 45,575.³⁶⁵ The number of art societies and organizations in St. Petersburg, Moscow, and the provinces increased including non-professional bodies such as the association of amateur women painters in St. Petersburg, formed in 1882.³⁶⁶ The number of journals concerned with art also grew, even if their existence was often short lived. The Imperial Academy of Arts published, under the editorship of the critic and curator of the Hermitage A.I. Somov, *The Herald of Fine Arts (Vestnik iziashchnykh iskusstv)* (1883-1889) which included the supplement *Art News (Khudozhestvennye novosti)* that passed comment on art news and events in St. Petersburg and Moscow, but which, not surprisingly concentrated on Academy artists and exhibitions. Other journals beginning in the 1880s were *Artist* (1889-1894) and *Art (Iskusstvo)* (1883-1884). Contemporary Russian art also began to be considered in the wider context of art history. Modern art history had become part of the university curriculum in the 1870s, but in the 1880s the chronicling of Russian art could be appreciated by

³⁶⁵ *Tpkhv*, vol. II, p. 631.

³⁶⁶ D.Ia. Severiukhin and O.L. Leikind, *Zolotoi vek khudozhestvennykh ob'edinenii v Rossii i SSSR (1820-1932)*, St. Petersburg, 1992, pp. 233-34.

the general art lover as well as university students. As in the rest of Europe, print technology in Russia continued to advance with the growth of image reproduction facilitated by developments in photoengraving and lithography. These advancements were visible in the growth of advertisements, the standard of illustrated journals, the number and availability of portrait-biography albums and also in the area of the art exhibition catalogue.

Publications issued in association with an exhibition, gallery or museum developed over the second half of the nineteenth century from being simple inventories to illustrated booklets with appendices and explanatory notes. The earliest catalogues of *Peredvizhniki* exhibition were inventories listing artist, work, and sometimes the work's owner. These *ukazateli* were not illustrated in the 1870s but two albums were produced in association with the second and third *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions. Illustrated catalogues of the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions only began to be produced regularly from 1888 when the firm of the family Hoppe, who published *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, produced one for the sixteenth exhibition.³⁶⁷ Hoppe, however, did not continue to produce *Peredvizhniki* catalogues and from 1889 and the seventeenth exhibition³⁶⁸ until the twenty-fourth exhibition in 1896, the task was taken over by N.P. Sobko, an art lover whose activities contributed enormously to the development of exhibition catalogues and guides, but who has somewhat been overshadowed by his contemporary V.V. Stasov. If Sobko is known at all today, it is as the editor of *Art and Applied Art (Iskusstvo i khudozhestvennaia promyshlennost')* (1898-1902), but from the early 1880s Sobko was one of the main compilers of catalogues of art exhibitions, including those of the *Peredvizhniki*. As was the case with the travelling exhibitions, the production of catalogues was both a matter of art scholarship and business. This is perhaps why Stasov, in his obituary of Sobko, only gave passing mention to them, devoting more attention

³⁶⁷ An illustrated catalogue was produced for the 12th TAE but regular publication did not begin until Hoppe's catalogue in 1888. One reason, perhaps, why Hoppe did not continue with the *Peredvizhniki* catalogues was the small scale of their print runs. The illustrated catalogue of the 16th TAE only sold 1, 204 copies in St. Petersburg, whereas the plain *ukazatel'* sold 6,779 copies.

³⁶⁸ N.P. Sobko, *Illustrirovannyi katalog XVII peredvizhnoi vystavki 'Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok'*, St. Petersburg, 1889. This catalogue cost one rouble fifty kopecks at the exhibition or if purchased from a shop one rouble twenty-five kopecks.

to Sobko's translations of Goethe into Russian.³⁶⁹ But Sobko's greatest contribution to Russian culture was not in literary translation, but in the development of sophisticated catalogues and exhibition guides.

Before producing catalogues for the *Peredvizhniki*, Sobko was involved in organizing and cataloguing a number of high profile exhibitions. In 1882, he compiled an illustrated catalogue for the art section of the 1882 All-Russian Exhibition in Moscow.³⁷⁰ The art section collected together the best of Russian art from the previous twenty-five years, works that been exhibited at the Academy and at *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions. It included Perov's portraits of Dostoevskii and Turgenev and Kramskoi's portrait of Tolstoi. This catalogue was a grand undertaking; the 1882 All-Russian Exhibition was not a World Exhibition, but it did try and emphasise Russia's international presence, as is reflected in Sobko's catalogue. The catalogue was printed in Russian and French parallel texts, making it accessible to an educated, international audience and in both the preface and the introduction to the second edition of the catalogue ('Publishing our first edition [...] we did not reckon on such success [...] in a very short time almost the whole run sold out')³⁷¹ Sobko makes continual references to the international publication of illustrated catalogues of art exhibitions and implicitly places his work in this exalted context. In the preface, he accuses Russian critics of being ignorant of the advances in image reproduction that foreign catalogues are making use of: 'But they, evidently, are not acquainted with foreign publications of this kind, where even more drawings are presented than in ours, and when no less complex details are given, in still smaller formats than ours.'³⁷² Sobko's catalogue featured more than two hundred and eighty copies of works of art, of which one hundred and seventy were drawn by their original artists. The catalogue also featured small biographies of all the artists. In size, it was easy to carry, each page measured approximately 16 x 25 cm and the smallness of the format was something critics rebuffed Sobko for: what was the point of producing such small reproductions of

³⁶⁹ V.V. Stasov, 'Nikolai Petrovich Sobko. Nekrolog', *Country (Strana)* no. 136, 17 August 1906. Reproduced in V.V. Stasov, *Stat'i i zametki, publikovavshiesia v gazetakh i ne voshedshie v knizhnye izdaniia*, pp. 198-200.

³⁷⁰ N.P. Sobko (comp.), *Illustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki v Moskve 1882 g.*, St. Petersburg, 1882.

³⁷¹ Sobko, 'Predislovie ko 2-mu izdaniuu', *Illustrirovannyi katalog*, p. I.

³⁷² *Ibid.*, p.II.

works of art? As Sobko clearly states, the critics missed the point of his catalogue: ‘They [critics] did not take into consideration our aims in designing a similar publication [to ones produced abroad] – to give the public the means to remind themselves of works at home, and to seek out in the exhibition works of art that they like.’³⁷³ Sobko was presenting a new type of catalogue for the Russian exhibition visitor, it was more than an *ukazatel’* but it was not an expensive album of beautifully engraved copies of oil paintings; it attempted to bring more to the visitor’s experience of the exhibition and place the exhibition in a wider context of contemporary Russian art and art history. In the introduction to the second edition, Sobko immediately informs the reader that the illustrated catalogue is not new overseas, and details its development in Paris, from the early years of the nineteenth century. He also mentions publications in London and Berlin. He does refer to the two illustrated albums of the second and third *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions, which according to Sobko suffered from problems in the slowness of production, resulting in editions, less than ten years later, being extremely rare. Sobko, therefore, saw his catalogue as something of a landmark event in Russian publishing and was not modest in his opinion of his work. His catalogue was something quite new for art related publications in Russia and at the end of his introduction he predicted future ventures:

If the public appreciate this enterprise, then in the future I hope to publish similar catalogues of a number of private and state collections of art, for I already have the relevant materials, it goes without saying only if we meet with no opposition from those persons, who own these collections or manage them.³⁷⁴

Sobko’s catalogue does not explicitly comment on portraits of writers, but it demonstrates the growing significance and sophistication of visual culture in Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century. It is evidence of the attempts by figures such as Sobko and Tret’iakov to promote contemporary Russian art; to heighten awareness of it amongst Russia’s growing educated middle class and to make it more accessible. As Sobko states, the catalogues were produced so visitors could take them home and remind themselves of the painting. Through

³⁷³ Sobko, ‘Predislovie’, *Illustrirovannyi katalog*, pp. I-II.

³⁷⁴ Sobko, ‘Vvedenie’, *Illustrirovannyi katalog*, p. XVI.

the purchase of a catalogue exhibition visitors also purchased their own *miniatiury- kopii*³⁷⁵ of great works of Russian art from the previous twenty-five years, including Kramskoi's portrait of Tolstoi and Perov's portraits of Turgenev and Dostoevskii (Figs. 50 & 51). These three writer portraits were reproduced in the catalogue; Tolstoi occupied half a page to himself whilst Turgenev and Dostoevskii shared a page with the other Perov portraits of Pogodin and Dal'.³⁷⁶ The portraits of Turgenev and Dostoevskii are small, and the reproduction of them simplifies some details, especially the hands. These line drawings relied a little on light and shade but were not as complex in this respect as later chromolithographed images. Although Sobko made the greatest effort to have the catalogue drawings made by the original artists and not 'by other persons, which often results in arbitrary alterations',³⁷⁷ in the case of Perov's portraits it was impossible as the artist had been ill at the beginning of 1882 and passed away at the end of May so the equally talented Kramskoi reproduced Perov's portraits as well as his own.

As well as the staging of grand, national exhibitions, the 1880s also saw the exhibition of works of individual *Peredvizhniki* artists that attracted considerable attention due to the fame these artists had now achieved amongst educated Russians. The founding members of the *Peredvizhniki* were no longer young idealistic students and in 1882 Perov passed away, followed by Kramskoi in 1887, their demise commemorated by countless articles and obituaries in the press³⁷⁸ and the posthumous exhibition of their works. In 1898-1899 Iaroshenko also received a posthumous exhibition³⁷⁹ and the celebrated status of Repin in

³⁷⁵ Sobko, 'Predislovie', *Illustrirovannyi katalog*, p. II.

³⁷⁶ The portrait of Tolstoi appeared on p. 44 and those of Dostoevskii and Turgenev on p. 80.

³⁷⁷ Sobko, 'Predislovie', *Illustrirovannyi katalog*, p. II.

³⁷⁸ Both Perov and Kramskoi received extensive obituaries and articles in the press on the event of their deaths. Perov's death and the illness that preceded it were much discussed in the press, as was the posthumous exhibition that many critics felt was badly organized. 'In Moscow his pictures were exhibited without any kind of system and without any order; but this was partly due to the limited location of the Society for Lovers of Art; in Petersburg, in the halls of the Academy of Art, where we are able to find complete spaciousness and total comfort, they are also exhibited exactly the same, if not worse.' Storonkii zritel', 'Vystavka i auktsion kartin V.G. Perova', *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal*, vol. V, no.1 January 1883, pp.61-65, p. 62.

³⁷⁹ A posthumous exhibition of the works of Iaroshenko was held first in the Academy of Arts, St. Petersburg in 1898 along with the works of I.I. Endogurov and I.I. Shishkin also recently deceased and then in Moscow, 1899 Iaroshenko was afforded an exhibition on his own. Both exhibitions included his portraits of Saltykov-Shchedrin and Tolstoi. *Katalog posmertnoi vystavki proizvedenii: I.I. Endogurov, I.I. Shishkin i N.A. Iaroshenko chlenov tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok*, St. Petersburg, 1898. *Katalog kartin, etiidov i risunkov N.A. Iaroshenko*, Moscow, 1899.

Russian society was truly marked by an exhibition of the artist's works whilst he was still alive in 1891.³⁸⁰

Although Sobko may have had in mind cataloguing private and public collections, his next undertaking was to produce a catalogue for the first of the abovementioned exhibitions, the posthumous exhibition of the works of V. G. Perov.³⁸¹ A few years later he engaged himself with the similar task of cataloguing the posthumous exhibition of the works of Kramskoi.³⁸²

The catalogue compiled and published by Sobko for the exhibition of Perov's posthumous works in Moscow and St. Petersburg in the winter of 1882-1883 deserves some attention. It indicates an understanding of what the Russian exhibition visitors wanted and the growing sophistication of this audience. The catalogue was again printed both in Russian and French, therefore European visitors could also purchase the item; it also placed the publication in the wider context of European art – this was not just a painter or an exhibition that only Russians should pay attention to. The catalogue comprised of a biography of Perov, a list of works and then a number of drawings of Perov's paintings, the drawings made by a variety of artists, from the well known (Kramskoi) to Sobko's own daughter. Sobko's essay in the catalogue was a short but detailed account of Perov's career; it was not discursive or polemic, but simply provided information. Perov's portraits of writers are mentioned, but only amongst the artist's other portraits and Sobko categorises all Perov's portraits as 'superb'. The catalogue also provides us with an idea of how the works were exhibited in the Academy of Arts halls, St. Petersburg. In the first hall were drawings and sketches, in halls two and three were paintings and portraits. Sobko provides a chronological list of all Perov's works, many of which, he notes, were not included in the exhibition, so the reader gets an historical overview of Perov's output as an artist. Given the number of portraits included at the exhibition we might have hoped to find some reproduced as illustrations, but there are only a

³⁸⁰ The front cover of the catalogue of this exhibition depicted Repin surrounded by his most famous works. The exhibition included Repin's portraits of Tolstoi both painted in 1891: *Tolstoi resting in the forest (Tolstoi na otdykh v lesu)* and *Tolstoi in his study (Tolstoi v kabinete)*. *Katalog vystavki kartin, portretov, eskizov i etiidov I.E. Repina v 1891*, St. Petersburg, 1891.

³⁸¹ N.P. Sobko (comp.), *Illustrirovannyi katalog posmertnoi vystavki proizvedenii V.G. Perova (1833-1882)*. St. Petersburg, 1883. This catalogue cost fifty kopecks if purchased at the exhibition, seventy-five if purchased from a shop.

³⁸² N.P. Sobko (comp.), *Illustrirovannyi katalog kartin, risunkov i graviur pokoinago I.N. Kramskogo (1837-1887)*, St. Petersburg, 1887.

few and none are of well known individuals, except the self portrait of Perov himself. Well known works such the *Bird catchers* and *Hunters at Rest* (Fig. 46) appeared, but no portraits of Dostoevskii or Turgenev. One possible reason for this, is that they appeared in the All-Russian Exhibition catalogue which is actually advertised on the reverse of the Perov catalogue, Sobko not missing an opportunity to reach his target audience. If Sobko had already produced a volume supplied with Perov's portraits, why repeat them and thus perhaps lose customers when by supplying different pictures he gave them another reason to purchase this catalogue?

The gradual diversification and development of the commercial side of art is evident in the growth of the illustrated catalogue. Many of the works in the *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions and those of individual artists already belonged to some collector, or if they were for sale, could not be afforded by most exhibition visitors. Yet through the purchase of a catalogue the exhibition visitor could take something of that exhibition home with them, including reproductions of the works of art. The second half of the nineteenth century also saw the increased commercialization of writers' portraits and the development of the commodity value of a writer's image. This would reach something of a climax in 1899 with the use of Pushkin's portrait by countless manufacturers in advertisements and on packaging. However, this phenomenon did not emerge from nowhere. From the 1860s onwards it is possible to see how the reproduction and possession of writers' portraits became the other means by which their visual representation was received in Russian society. If illustrated journals offered their readers the opportunity to read about the exhibition of the originals, they also offered them the possibility to own their own portraits of writers. The creation of ones own portrait gallery of famous individuals was possible through the collection of photographs, lithographs, and even by purchasing cigarettes and chocolates.

iv. Beyond the Galleries: the Reproduction and Possession of Images

Although exhibitions offered the Russian public an unprecedented opportunity to view painted portraits of Russian writers, even more accessible outlets for the display and consumption of images rapidly developed over the course of the second half of the nineteenth century. The growth and success of print culture, in particular publications and printed matter aimed at the lower and middle class consumer, was one of the greatest achievements of this era. Jeffrey Brooks provides a comprehensive study of the growth of literacy and print culture in Russia in the second half of the nineteenth century and pays particular attention to printed fiction aimed at the lower classes such as cheap detective and adventure stories. Although some of the materials examined in this thesis would appeal to a more prosperous socio-economic group due to their cost, the illustrated journal, Brooks argues, attracted a wide audience and ‘constituted a step toward a more unified literary culture’³⁸³ Not only was it possible for a nineteenth-century audience to view images of writers in the confined space of an exhibition or gallery; opportunities for them to possess an image of a writer dramatically increased as reproductions of paintings, photographs, and engravings proliferated and were offered at prices to suit all pockets. Printing and photomechanical processes³⁸⁴ underwent a constant stream of development, which both raised the standard and lowered the cost of reproduced pictures and illustrations. Portraits of writers appeared in a variety of printed sources in the second half of the nineteenth century: in the pages of illustrated journals, in portrait-biography albums, in illustrated *kalendari*³⁸⁵, as *cartes-de-visite*, as frontispieces to collections of a writer’s work or in biographies or literary studies. Towards the end of the nineteenth century images of writers also appeared on commercial items such as cigarette cartons and confectionery wrappers. This section will examine the representation of writers in these widely reproduced images, most of which derived from photographic portraits. It is not

³⁸³ Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, p. 109.

³⁸⁴ The term ‘photomechanical’ is used to describe all techniques in which the method of printing is mechanical. It first came into use in the 1880s. Q. Bajac, *The Invention of Photography*, London, 2002, p. 151.

³⁸⁵ *Kalendari* were substantial yearbooks or almanacs produced by major publishing houses that could contain everything from dates of religious holidays to theatre seating plans.

the aim of this section to supply an inventory of every photograph, engraving or lithograph of Nekrasov, Shchedrin, Ostrovskii, et al. Rather, by using a number of examples of printed portraits from a variety of sources that were in the public domain, we aim to provide an overview of the type of images available, how they were presented, the way they compared to the *Peredvizhniki* portraits and how together with painted portraits they contributed to the representation of writers' identities in this period.

When passing an initial glance over the portraits of writers reproduced in the above mentioned sources one fact becomes clear. What all the different printed sources have in common is the infrequency with which they reproduced the *Peredvizhnik* portraits, or any painted portraits for that matter, of writers living in the camera age (from the 1850s onwards). For example, Saltykov-Shchedrin was painted by three major artists in his lifetime; by Ge in 1872, Kramskoi in 1879 and Iaroshenko in 1887. Both the Ge portrait and the Kramskoi portrait were exhibited in *Peredvizhniki* exhibitions and the Kramskoi portrait could also be seen by visitors to the Tret'iakov Gallery. However, the first time the Kramskoi portrait was reproduced in print was in 1901, in the album, *Galereia russkikh pisatelei*.³⁸⁶ The Ge portrait was not reproduced until 1904 when it appeared in an illustrated catalogue of the Russian Museum of Aleksandr III.³⁸⁷ When portraits of Saltykov were reproduced they were often taken from photographs made by well known photographers, particularly K.A. Shapiro whose images account for most of the subsequent engraved and lithographed portraits of the writer.³⁸⁸ For example, Fig. 52 is a wood engraving of a Shapiro photograph taken in 1870, and that appeared in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* in 1881.³⁸⁹

³⁸⁶ I. Ignatov, *Galereia russkikh pisatelei*, Moscow, 1901. Although this publication appeared outside the period of this study it deserves mention. This portrait-biography album included profiles of approximately 200 writers from Kantemir to Tolstoi. What makes it particularly remarkable was its use of *Peredvizhniki* portraits including Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii, p.391; and Kramskoi's portraits of Goncharov, p. 233, Saltykov-Shchedrin, p. 335 and Tolstoi, p. 237.

³⁸⁷ Strugatskii, *Ukazatel' portretov M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina*, p. 20.

³⁸⁸ Ibid., lists a least six Shapiro photographs of Saltykov that would be reproduced numerous times. pp. 27-29.

³⁸⁹ M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, engraved by P.F. Borel' and P. Baranovskii, *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 660, 29 August 1881, p. 176.

The reasons behind the decision of publishers not to reproduce *Peredvizhniki* portraits are it seems mainly practical.³⁹⁰ In Russia for most of the nineteenth century there were no laws as regards the copyright of photographic images, once a photograph was in the public sphere anyone could copy and reproduce it. Paintings, however, could definitely be identified as the property of a person or an institution and it seems permission was needed for their initial reproduction. One example of this is Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii, owned by Tret'iakov. The literary historian and critic Petr Nikolaevich Polevoi (1839-1902) was in June 1876 preparing a third edition of his *History of Russian Literature in Essays and Biographies* (*Istoriia russkoi literatury v ocherkakh i biografiakh*).³⁹¹ Polevoi was a critic and compiler who seemed to appreciate and understand the use of accompanying portraits to biographies. His letter to Tret'iakov is worth quoting as it demonstrates the difficulties that faced those producing illustrated materials in the 1870s:

Fedor Mikhailovich pointed out to me that this portrait is the only one made of him during the whole of his life. So could you be so kind as to provide me with a photographic copy of the portrait belonging to you? I would be extremely obliged to you and it will get me out of great difficulty, since Fedor Mikhailovich under no circumstances would want to sit for a second portrait, and it most necessary for me to have a portrait of Dostoevskii, because all the biographies will be supplied with portraits (except the biography of Count. L. Tolstoi) and they must be very good. I hope, that you will give me an answer, if possible, quite quickly, since the drawing and engraving of a portrait takes, probably, around three months...³⁹²

³⁹⁰ Patricia Anderson argues that there was a general absence of 'art' in British illustrated magazines and advertising. 'As it had done before 1860, and would continue to do in the latter part of the century and beyond, art would withdraw further and further from common experience, returning to expensively appointed homes, costly books and magazines, and galleries and museums that would remain firmly closed on Sundays.' *The Printed Image and the Transformation of Popular Culture 1790-1860*, Oxford, 1991. This claim seems rather exaggerated, at least in relation to the situation in Russia. Illustrated journals carried a variety of images, from reproductions of Old Masters to examples of the latest scientific discoveries. J. Brooks points out that *Niva* in the early years of publication offered its subscription readers 'large coloured prints [...] in a respectable and traditional style' by Russian artists including K.E. Makovskii and Iu. Klever. *When Russia Learned to Read*, p. 113.

³⁹¹ N.P. Polevoi, *Istoriia russkoi literatury v ocherkakh i biografiakh*, St. Petersburg. The first edition of this work appeared in 1872, with engravings by L.A. Seriakov. A second edition appeared in 1874; a third 1878; a fourth 1881-1883 and a fifth 1888-1890.

³⁹² Polevoi-Tret'iakov, 1 June 1876, quoted in 'Pis'ma o Dostoevskom', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 86, 1973, pp. 349-564, p. 449.

Tret'iakov did supply Polevoi with a photograph which was subsequently drawn and engraved by Ivan Stepanovich Panov (1845-1883). Panov studied engraving at the Academy of Arts and was highly regarded for his skill in wood engraving, the medium used to produce the Perov portrait.³⁹³ For some reason - perhaps it took longer to engrave than Polevoi anticipated - it did not make it into Polevoi's third edition published in 1878, although portraits of Pushkin, Gogol, Goncharov and Turgenev did.³⁹⁴ The Dostoevskii portrait did not appear till the fourth edition went to press in 1881. By this time Polevoi had already published a brief essay on Dostoevskii in the journal *Little Light (Ogonek)*,³⁹⁵ no. 33, 1879, where the engraving of the Perov portrait also appeared. Panov's reproduction of Perov's portrait subsequently featured in 1881 in the journal *Education and Teaching (Vospitanie i obuchenie)* (Fig. 40), *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* and in the *Universal Almanac for 1882 (Vseobshchii kalendar' na 1882)*.³⁹⁶ One thing unites *Ogonek*, *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* and the *kalendar'* - they were all issued by the same publishing firm, the family firm of Herman Hoppe.³⁹⁷ The appearance of the Panov engraving is an example of the practice of image repetition; once a publishing firm had an image, in this case a portrait, with which they were satisfied what reason was there to commission another? In the above case the repetition was in different journals published by the one company but, as we will see, certain portraits were repeated in the same publications over

³⁹³ D.A. Rovinskii, *Podrobnyi slovar' russkikh graverov XVI-XX*, St. Petersburg, 1895, col. 759.

³⁹⁴ N.P. Polevoi, *Istoriia russkoi literatury v ocherkakh i biografiakh*, St. Petersburg, 1878, pp. 499, 572, 615 and 619. It is evident Polevoi only employed highly skilled copiers and engravers. Panov it seems drew and engraved the portraits of Gogol, Goncharov and Turgenev whilst another well known engraver, Adolphe François Pannemaker (1822-1900) engraved the Pushkin portrait. Pannemaker reproduced works of art for a number of illustrated journals and in the 1880s and 1890s produced a number of Pushkin portraits for them. The portrait featured in Polevoi's book was based on an engraved portrait made by the British artist Thomas Wright (1792-1849) in 1837.

³⁹⁵ There were a number of journals published in the Russian Empire bearing the title of *Ogonek*. This thesis is concerned with *Ogonek* published by Hoppe from 1879-1883. However, this should not be confused with a later *Ogonek* published by a S.M. Rubinshtein from 1899-1918. This latter *Ogonek* is discussed by Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, pp. 115-117 but he does not make it clear that there was a earlier publication of the same name. The two *Ogoneks* were quite different. Whereas Hoppe's publication concentrated on literature and featured biographies of the major Russia writers, the later *Ogonek*, according to Brooks, concentrated on the news and sensational romance, adventure and detective short stories.

³⁹⁶ All these portraits are listed in *MnpFMD: Ogonek*, no. 33, 1879, entry no. 3127, p. 245; *Vospitanie i obuchenie*, vol. I, 1881, entry no. 3141, p. 246; *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 630, 1881, p. 108, entry no. 3142, p. 247; *Vseobshchii kalendar' na 1882*, St. Petersburg, 1882, entry no. 3163, p. 248.

the course of years. In the 1870s and 1880s the only other copy of the Perov portrait was made by Kramskoi, who drew and engraved Perov's portraits of Dostoevskii, Turgenev, Pogodin and Dal' for an illustrated album of the second *Peredvizhniki* exhibition published in St. Petersburg in 1873.³⁹⁸ N.P. Sobko later reproduced these portraits in his 1882 catalogue of the art section of the All-Russian Exhibition (Figs. 50 & 51).³⁹⁹ Sobko, as has been mentioned, made much of the fact that the pictures that appeared in his catalogue had, wherever possible, been copied by the original artists, or other highly skilled artists.

Roger Hargreaves has observed that 'an engraving of a photograph is no nearer the original than an engraving of a painting'⁴⁰⁰ but there seems to have been less concern with the reproduction of photographs, which in the 1860s and 1870s still had to be drawn and then engraved or lithographed. The dubious status of photography and photographers may have contributed towards this attitude. If the original image is not a 'work of art' then you do not need an artist to contribute to its reproduction. However, this does not mean that the non-use of painted portraits demonstrated an aesthetic preference for photographs or that publishers and printers were motivated by a belief that a photograph produced a 'better' portrait. That photographs were easier to obtain and as the century progressed, easier to reproduce, is a highly significant factor but one must also ask the question: what was the *purpose* behind photographers creating an image and then either they, or a publishing firm, reproducing it?

For some photographers, there does seem to have been a desire to create a photographic portrait that fulfilled the same needs as a painted portrait of this time. They attempted to capture the inner qualities of a subject, to represent something of the person's psyche and emotions as painters did. An outstanding example of this is the work of the Moscow photographer Mikhail

³⁹⁷ Herman Hoppe, along with A.F. Marks, was one of the major publishers of illustrated journals and books in Russia from the 1860s. After his death in 1885 his publishing empire continued to grow under the management of his sons.

³⁹⁸ This album of engravings is simply titled *Al'bom 2-i peredvizhnaia vystavka*, St. Petersburg, 1873. Along with the portraits of the writers, Kramskoi also engraved two peasant portraits by Perov and all six appear on the same page. Kramskoi also produced engravings of his own work *Christ in the Wilderness* (1872) and designed the title page. See Gold'shtein, *I.N. Kramskoi*, pp. 404-405.

³⁹⁹ Sobko, *Illiustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki*. The portrait of Tolstoi appears on p. 44 and Perov's portraits on p. 80.

⁴⁰⁰ Hargreaves, 'Putting Faces to the Names', p. 43.

Mikhailovich Panov (1836-1894).⁴⁰¹ Panov, a friend of Kramskoi and an artist before he turned to photography, was known as an ‘artist-photographer’ amongst his contemporaries⁴⁰² and he had close connections with the *Peredvizhniki*. He took a now famous photograph of the members of the Society in 1885, posed as if in debate and conversation with one another, some standing, some sitting on chairs, some on the floor. He also produced phototypes⁴⁰³ of Ge’s illustrations to Tolstoi’s book *What Men Live By* (*Chem liudi zhivy*) (1886).⁴⁰⁴ Panov photographed a number of famous cultural figures over the course of his career including Tolstoi, Ostrovskii, Turgenev and Dostoevskii. The success of this latter portrait has already been commented on and demonstrates Panov’s skill as an ‘artist-photographer’ but it does not lessen the fact that Panov needed his photography to be profitable. One way was to photograph ordinary people for a fee, the other was to photograph famous people and produce copies for ordinary people to buy. The commercial success of writers’ portraits is one of the principal reasons for their production. Unlike Tret’iakov, whose business financed his portraits, photographers’ portraits were their business and also the business of publishers who reproduced them. The commercial value of a writer’s image reached a zenith in the 1890s with the use of Pushkin’s portrait (discussed in part two) but this phenomenon of the writer as a commodity was already under way in the 1860s. Panov the ‘artist-photographer’ was no exception and he was also, it seems, a ‘businessman-photographer’. Tat’iana Shipova notes that Panov made use early on in his career of advertisements in newspapers and cites his promotion of his 1867 photograph of Turgenev⁴⁰⁵ (Fig. 53):

⁴⁰¹ It seems he was not related to the aforementioned engraver of the same name.

⁴⁰² T.N. Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvyy – na pamiat’ budushchemu (1839-1930)*, Moscow, 2001, p. 234.

⁴⁰³ ‘Phototype’ in Russian *phototipia*, is a photomechanical process of image reproduction also known in English as collotype or albertype (French: *phototypie*, German: *Lichtdruck*) This method of reproduction was based on the carbon print process developed by Alphonse Poitevin at the end of the 1850s. This served as the basis for the majority of photomechanical processes that appeared after 1865, firstly woodburytype, and then collotype. Collotype was developed by Josef Albert in Germany and the first commercial collotypes appeared at the end of the 1860s. The making and printing of collotype plates was highly skilled and expensive but it was valued for the reproduction of drawings and paintings as it was the only photomechanical process capable of reproducing tone until the 1880s and 1890s and the advent of gravure processes. See A. Griffiths, *Prints and Printmaking*, London, 1996, p. 126 and Bajac, *The Invention of Photography*, pp. 116-118.

⁴⁰⁴ Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvyy*, p. 241.

⁴⁰⁵ This photograph is listed in I.E. Grudinina (comp.), *Opisanie rukopisei i izobrazitel’nykh materialov Pushkinskogo doma. IV I.S. Turgenev*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1958, (hereafter

Available for sale is the photographic portrait of Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev, taken during his time in Russia in March this year of 1867. This portrait provoked the following remark from I.S. Turgenev: "No other photographic portrait of me has been so artistic or expressive". These bold words give the photographer the right to attract the attention of admirers of the literary talent of Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev to the fact that this photograph of his portrait is available in various sizes at the following prices: large portrait on bristol⁴⁰⁶ paper – five roubles, middle size – two roubles, *vizitnaia kartochka* – fifty kopecks. It is also possible to obtain here portraits and *kartochki* of other writers, actors and famous people in general.⁴⁰⁷

By 1867 Turgenev was a famous literary figure both in Russia, and due to the writer's chosen exile, in Europe too. He had published *Fathers and Sons* (*Ottsy i deti*) some five years earlier and in 1867 published *Smoke* (*Dym*). Neither *Fathers and Sons* nor *Smoke* received particularly good critical reviews and one must consider how much the photograph was an act of self promotion on Turgenev's part. This might seem unlikely as only a few years earlier the writer had considered withdrawing from literature altogether⁴⁰⁸ and Panov represents Turgenev not in an entirely flattering manner. But Turgenev, who as we have seen was one of the most painted writers of his time, was also one of the most photographed. He had strong opinions with regards to his visual representation and was interested in the thoughts of others on the subject. As we can see from a number of letters sent by Turgenev to his publishing firm the Brothers Salaev, the writer involved himself in the creation of a portrait front piece. In a letter to F.I. Salaev Turgenev firstly addressed practical matters. 'As regards the expenses of the portrait – let's go halves; moreover I will order it from a German engraver, who made a portrait of Nekrasov – which including all expenses cost no more than 300 roubles.'⁴⁰⁹ Turgenev was referring to the German printing company of F.A. Brokhaus, based in Leipzig.⁴¹⁰ The Brokhaus company

OPdTurg), entry no. 461, p. 66. It was subsequently engraved and reproduced in *Gazeta A. Gatsuka*, no.8, 1879 and *Rodina*, no. 36, 1893. See *OPdTurg*, entry, 565, p. 92.

⁴⁰⁶ Bristol paper is a heavyweight thick paper first made in Bristol by plying single sheets of paper together.

⁴⁰⁷ M.M. Panov, advertisement from *Moskovskie vedomosti*, 13 April 1867, quoted in Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvyy*, p. 233.

⁴⁰⁸ Terras, *A History of Russian Literature*, p. 332.

⁴⁰⁹ I.S. Turgenev-F.I. Salaev, 14 March 1879, I.S. Turgenev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*, vol. XII, book, II, p. 48.

⁴¹⁰ The F.A. Brokhaus printing firm was established in Leipzig by Frederick Arnold Brokhaus (1772-1823) at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It was a large firm which took on international orders and which in 1890 joined forces with the St. Petersburg publishing firm I.A.

produced a number of portraits for front pieces of collected works in the nineteenth century, including the one mentioned by Turgenev, a front piece for the first volume of a posthumous edition of Nekrasov's poems in 1879.⁴¹¹ It seems that the Brokhaus engraving of Turgenev was not completed in time as volume one of the Salaev Brothers' *Sochineniia I.S. Turgeneva* featured a photograph taken by Levitskii in 1879 (Fig. 54).⁴¹² This photograph was made especially for the Salaev edition and was not reproduced as an engraving but as a woodburytype (or photoglypt) which, as can be seen from the illustration, is somewhere between a photograph and a print.⁴¹³ Turgenev referred to his portrait in the forward to the work. 'Included in this edition is a photographic portrait not engraved [...] but reproduced by new photoglyptic method. This method is advantageous as the small details of the original are exactly preserved, moreover, nothing in the image is deleted or retouched.'⁴¹⁴

However, a Brokhaus engraving of Turgenev was finally produced in 1882. This portrait was copied from another Panov photograph, taken of Turgenev around June 1880 when he was in Moscow for the Pushkin Celebrations. Turgenev declared this to be the best photograph of him to date and 'the greatest likeness'.⁴¹⁵ After Turgenev's death the photograph made a startling appearance as a wood engraving on the front cover of *Vsemirnaia*

Efron to produce the now famous Brokhaus and Efron *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, St. Petersburg, 1890-1900. For detailed information of the publishing activities of the Brokhaus company, see Brokhaus and Efron *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, vol. VIII, St. Petersburg, 1891, pp. 701-704.

⁴¹¹ N.A. Nekrasov, *Stikhotvoreniia N.A. Nekrasova. Postmertnoe izdanie. Tom I 1845-1860*, St. Petersburg, 1879. The engraving was of one of the most distinctive portraits of Nekrasov, showing the writer in a fur coat and hat. (Fig. 55) The engraving was taken from an original photograph by A.I. Denier in 1868. It was also reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* no. 51, 1892, p. 428.

⁴¹² I.S. Turgenev, *Sochineniia I.S. Turgeneva (1844-1868-1874-1880). Tom pervyi*, Moscow, 1880. In a letter to the historian and publisher M.M. Stasiulevich, 2 May 1879, Turgenev refers to two portraits, one a Denier photograph and another, which he states is ordered from Leipzig for the future Salaev edition. Turgenev notes that 'This photograph has still not been made'. I.S. Turgenev-M.M. Stasiulevich, 2 May 1879, I.S. Turgenev, *Polnoe sobranie*, vol. XII, book, II, p. 73. The accompanying editor's notes to this letter state that the Denier photograph was reproduced as a wood engraving by I.I. Matiushin for the 1879 edition of *Zapiski okhotnika*.

⁴¹³ This photomechanical process was developed in 1865 by Thomas Woodbury. It was a complex process and involved making a lead mould of a carbon photographic print, then pouring gelatine into the mould and pressing paper on top. See Griffiths, *Prints and Printmaking*, p. 155 and Bajac, *The Invention of Photography*, p. 117.

⁴¹⁴ I.S. Turgenev, 'Predislovie', *Sochineniia I.S. Turgeneva*, vol. I, p. VI.

⁴¹⁵ Turgenev-A.V. Toporov, 17 August 1882, quoted in *OPdTurg*, entry no. 568, p. 92. The photographer Levitskii also regarded this photograph as the best of any of Turgenev. '[...] the lighting and the successful capturing of expression are without doubt the very best'. S.L. Levitskii-M.M. Stasiulevich, 29 September 1883. Quoted in *OPdTurg*, entry no. 529, p. 83.

illiustratsiia, 3 September 1883 (Fig. 56)⁴¹⁶ where it practically filled the entire page. It then appeared as the Brokhaus engraving in the second edition of the *Complete Collected Works of I.S. Turgenev (Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I.S. Turgeneva)* published in ten volumes in 1884 by the Glazunov firm⁴¹⁷ (Fig. 57) and later in the *Literaturnyi illiustrirovannyi kalendar' na 1887*.⁴¹⁸

As has been discussed Turgenev was the one writer whom painters failed to successfully capture on canvas, which is somewhat ironic given the writer's passion for art. Turgenev seems to have had an equally poor time with photography and Iu.P. Pishchulin notes in his study on Turgenev and art that Turgenev frequently made reference in his letters to his disappointment over photographs of himself; he often found them to be 'gloomy' and 'sombre'.⁴¹⁹ Panov's 1867 photograph, allegedly, Turgenev found to be the most artistic and expressive and but it too could certainly be seen as 'gloomy' and 'sombre' and presents us with a melancholy individual. Turgenev gazes at a point outside the photograph; the gaze of writers in photographs is an interesting subject and rarely do they stare directly at the camera (viewer). The viewer is drawn to Turgenev's eyes because due to Panov either placing Turgenev against a plain background or at a later stage retouching the background out, his mass of white hair and beard seem to blend away. Thus, the deep shadows around his eyes and the deep lines between the nose and cheeks dramatically stand out and do not present an image that flatters, but rather seems to age; Turgenev was only forty-nine when he sat for Panov. However, in stark contrast to the vulnerability expressed in the writer's facial expression is the bulk of Turgenev's body clothed in a fairly heavy short double-breasted jacket buttoned right up to the writer's collar over which hangs a pince-nez. This jacket, an example of the loose shape favoured in men's fashions in the 1860s, seems rather heavy for an interior shot (though it was March) and it does appear as if we had caught Turgenev about to go out for a walk. Given Turgenev's strained relationship with Russia and his brief return visits, perhaps Panov intended to give the

⁴¹⁶ *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 765, 3 September 1883, front cover. Wood engraving by I.I. Khlemitskii. See *OPdTurg*, entry no. 601, p. 103.

⁴¹⁷ *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I.S. Turgeneva vol. I*, St. Petersburg, 1884.

⁴¹⁸ *Literaturnyi illiustrirovannyi kalendar' na 1887*, published by I.D. Sytin, Moscow, 1887, p. 59.

⁴¹⁹ Iu.P. Pishchulin, *I.S. Turgenev. Zhizn'. Iskusstvo. Vremia*, Moscow, 1998, p. 52.

impression of a man about to depart, it is impossible to say, but the use of the jacket is as effective as Perov's presentation of Dostoevskii in his overcoat.

Whatever Panov's intentions, he knew, or believed, one thing – there was a market for this portrait and others like it. 'Admirers of literary talent' could purchase their own portrait of their favourite writer, or, in the case of the *vizitnaia kartochka* – *carte de visite* create a whole album of Russia's greatest writers and other celebrities. The creation of photographic portraits of writers and the subsequent sale of these images demonstrates that writers had strong popular appeal and were a profitable subject for those in the business of image reproduction. One photographer who was fully aware of the commercial possibilities of portraits of writers was the St. Petersburg photographer K.A. Shapiro. We will look in greater detail at Shapiro's work further on, in particular, his collection of writers' portraits. For now, we refer to his reaction to the death of Dostoevskii, whom he photographed in his coffin. Dostoevskii died on 28 January 1881 and just over a week later, on 6 February the following letter from Shapiro appeared in the *Novosti i birzhevaia gazeta*:

Dear Sir,

Permit me to ask you for space in your newspaper for the following announcement. The heavy loss, suffered by Russia a few days ago, with the passing away of F.M. Dostoevskii, prompted among those nearest and dearest to him the need to commemorate the memory of the deceased with a reproduction of his portrait, which I was so invited by the widow of Fedor Mikhailovich the day after his death to make. The portrait was taken by me, by photographic means, from life, it is edged around with a vignette, composed from all the wreaths sent on the occasion of the death from various institutions and towns, and in addition with a detailed description of each of them, and moreover, with a copy of the autograph of the deceased and his dates of birth and death.

The size of the portrait is one arshin by $\frac{3}{4}$ arshin. The price of the portrait is three roubles, fifty kopecks of which I personally will deduct for the construction of a monument or bursary in the name of the deceased. Persons wishing to acquire this portrait of F.M. can contact my photographic studio immediately, because these portraits will be not be for sale elsewhere.⁴²⁰

⁴²⁰ K.A. Shapiro, 'Pis'mo v redaktsiiu', *Novosti i birzhevaia gazeta*, 6 February 1881, p. 3. Two years later, Shapiro made a similar attempt to capitalise on Turgenev's death. *OPdTurg* reproduces a number of extracts from newspapers from August and September 1883 that commented upon Shapiro's activities. Evidently, the photographer held an exhibition in his studio on Nevskii prospect of photographs of Turgenev he had previously taken in 1876 and 1879. He also made copies of these for sale book and print shops. A letter from Shapiro, much like the Dostoevskii one, appeared in *Novoe vremia*, 30 August 1883, which also stated that the sale of prints of photographs would go towards establishing a Turgenev memorial fund. See *OPdTurg*, entry no. 515, p. 80.

As well as considering the presentation of Dostoevskii's portrait with the added elements of a vignette and autograph, Shapiro made a feature of the exclusivity of the item; this particular image would not be found elsewhere or at a cheaper price. However, commercially successful portraits did not necessarily have to have an air of exclusivity, rather, this period sees certain portraits being repeated and continually reproduced, depending on their visual currency. Some portraits remain popular throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, such as portraits of S.T. Aksakov which all derived from a photograph taken in 1859. Other portraits, such as those of Tolstoi that did not show the writer in traditional Russian dress were reproduced with less frequency until seeing the writer in a smart suit and tie now came as something of a shock. By the 1860s, portraits were not only purchased by a wealthy elite who could afford high quality paintings and engravings, but also by an ever growing band of readers for whom the purchase of a writer's portrait was possible in the form of a fifty kopeck *vizitnaia kartochka*.

One of the most favoured forms of photographic reproduction in the 1850s and 1860s were *cartes-de-visite*, or as they were also known in Russia, *vizitnye kartochki* or simply *vizitki*. The first patent for the *carte-de-visite* format was taken out in Paris in 1854 and from the 1860s these small prints glued to cardboard or stiff paper, approximately 6 x 10cm, became tremendously popular. The size of social visiting cards (hence their name) *cartes-de-visite* had two principal roles. Firstly, they enabled ordinary individuals to sit for inexpensive photographs of themselves that they could then give to loved ones (*cartes-de-visite* were in great demand in America at the time of the Civil War). Secondly, *cartes-de-visite* became collectibles as photographers realised the profits to be made by producing cards bearing the image of well-known figures, particularly royalty. In other words, they transcended their original 'visiting' function. In Britain, the most popular *carte-de-visite*, showing the Princess of Wales taken in 1867, had, by 1885, sold over three hundred thousand copies.⁴²¹ In Russia, *cartes-de-visite* were also extremely popular and all the major studios including those of Levitskii, Andrei Ivanovich Denier (1820-1892) and Mikhail

⁴²¹ R. & C. Wichard, *Victorian Cartes-de-Visite*, Princes Risborough, 1999, p. 35.

Tulinov (Moscow photographer 1860s-70s) all produced them.⁴²² Due to the commercial success of these cards ('cartomania') the pirating of photographs was also widely practised and as publishers ran out of living subjects to feature, they turned from photographs to paintings and engravings of historic figures. A precursor to the cigarette card, which evolved as a collectible item in the 1880s, the *carte-de-visite* was one of the cheapest ways to obtain an images of one's heroes, and these cards were designed to be kept, sold and swapped; special cases and albums were produced for their presentation. Perhaps due to the overtly commercial nature of celebrity *cartes-de-visite*, they have sometimes been overlooked in scholarly works on photography, which instead focus on developments made in the 'art' of photography. It was disappointing, although perhaps not surprising, when a recent work published by the Hermitage, *Peterburgskii al'bom*, was rather dismissive of *cartes-de-visite* produced by the 'Vezenberg and Co.' photography studio. Two examples of the *vizitki* produced by Vezenberg and Co. are shown in Figs. 58 and 59 - portraits of the writers Nekrasov and S.T. Aksakov. The 'Vezenberg and Co.' studio was established by Jakov-Jordan Wilhelm Vezenberg and was operational from the middle of the 1860s at 55 Fontanka, St. Petersburg. *Petersburgskii al'bom* presents Vezenberg and Co. as an example of everything that was wrong with commercial photography at this time. The main activity of the Vezenberg business was indeed the 'pirating' of images produced by other photographers. However, in Russia there was no law in place that covered the ownership of photographic images, so although the Vezenberg business may have been unethical, it was not illegal. The criticism laid at the Vezenberg studio was that it concentrated on the production of *vizitki* which are of 'a more mechanical than artistic character'.⁴²³ The Vezenberg studio was 'typical of those photographers of the second half of the nineteenth century, who, having mastered the art of shooting, turned it into a mere occupation, and did not set themselves the task of cultivating the artistic possibilities of photography.'⁴²⁴ David Elliot shares the concerns of Miroljubova and Petrova by observing that in the 1860s and 1870s

⁴²² Elliot, *Photography in Russia*, p. 35.

⁴²³ Miroljubova & Petrova, *Peterburgskii al'bom*, p. 11.

⁴²⁴ Ibid.

‘the rapid commercialisation of photography led to a crisis in quality’ and referring to an 1880 article in the journal *Photograph (Fotograf)* which complained that ‘photography in Russia is descending into commercial production.’⁴²⁵ But by criticising the lack of artistry and the commercial aspect of these images, scholars fail to recognise the significance of the Vezenberg studio and others like them; *cartes-de-visite* may not have striven for artistic innovation but that was not their primary purpose and consumers did not demand this of them. As Elliot notes, ‘great importance was attached to a well thought out, natural pose – the depiction of the inner person was not part of their brief.’⁴²⁶

As can also be seen from our two examples, there was no room for luxurious settings or various accessories, the focus was the person. The existence of *cartes-de-visite* and their commercial, if not artistic, success demonstrate the demand there was for portraits of well known individuals and for an accessible way in which consumers could discover what someone looked like.

However, the absence of any supporting titles or text explaining who the subject might be on the Vezenberg *vizitki* (the only name is that of Vezenberg and Co.) indicates that purchasers of these cards knew who the subjects were before they bought the cards, which meant the portrait on the card had to reflect other images of the writer in the public domain; what is the point of buying a card unless you know who the subject is, unless of course the real focus of the card is the anonymous subject’s physical features, be it beauty, strength or a deformity.⁴²⁷ Therefore the purpose of these cards, and of other widely produced affordable portraits in general, such as those in illustrated journals was to provide an image that clearly presented the physical likeness of the subject, and reinforced this image, but they did not have to go beyond that; there was no real demand for artistic innovation.

⁴²⁵ Elliot, *Photography in Russia*, p. 36. *Fotograf*, no. 1, 1880, p.1. *Fotograf* (1880-84) was one of many journals concerned with photography published at this time.

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁴²⁷ *Cartes-de-visite* that depicted individuals famous for their appearance became particularly popular in America. One New York producer of *cartes-de-visite* issued over two thousand portraits of subjects that included bearded ladies and Siamese twins. The American midget showman ‘General Tom Thumb’ (Charles Stratton) even had his wedding photographs published as *cartes*. R. & C. Wichard, *Victorian Cartes-de-Visite*, p. 41.

The carte-de-visite of Aksakov is an example of a 'pirated' image as the original photograph was taken in 1859 in the Moscow studio of Karl August Bergner (working in Moscow in the 1850s and 1860s).⁴²⁸ Although Aksakov is not one of the writers this thesis has focused on, his case demonstrates the repeated use of one image and the preference of those engaged in the production of images to use an image established in the public consciousness. The Bergner photograph, as well as appearing in *cartes-de-visite* form, was also the basis for subsequent portraits of Aksakov painted by Perov and Kramskoi (Fig. 60).⁴²⁹ It was the model of 'Aksakov-iconography' from which all future representations of the Slavophile writer were made. For example, in 1891 a version of it appeared on the pages of *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* (Fig. 61).⁴³⁰ It made an earlier appearance however, more skilfully reproduced as a lithograph, in one of the most famous series of Russian 'portrait-biographies' produced by the lithographic workshop Aleksandr Ersentovich Miunster (1824-1908).⁴³¹

Portrait-Biography Albums

'Lithographs rarely succeed in communicating the nature, especially the expression of a face.' K.A. Shapiro.⁴³²

Collections of portraits of well-known public figures and statesmen had been produced in Russia since the eighteenth century but the earliest work to concentrate on writers in particular was published in 1801 by the historian, bibliophile and 'first Russian iconographer'⁴³³ Platon Petrovich Beketov (1761-1836). *A Pantheon of Russian Authors (Panteon rossiiskikh avtorov)*⁴³⁴ was issued in four volumes, each of which contained five engraved portraits of Russian writers such as Lomonosov and Kantemir, but also included portraits of

⁴²⁸ T. Saburova, 'Fotografiia A. Bergnera v Moskve', *Sovetskoe Foto*, March 1991, pp. 36-39.

⁴²⁹ Kramskoi also made a portrait of T.G. Shevchenko (1871) taken from a photograph by A.I. Denier. S. Morozov, *Russkaia khudozhestvennaia fotografiia*, (hereafter referred to as *Rkhf*) Moscow, 1955, p. 34.

⁴³⁰ *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 38, 1891, p. 192.

⁴³¹ For a brief biography of Miunster and the establishment of his lithographic workshop see his entry in the Brokhaus and Efron *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, vol. XX, St. Petersburg, 1897, p. 365.

⁴³² K.A. Shapiro, 'Ot izdatelia' *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, i artistov s biografiiami i faksimilie*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1880, vol. I.

⁴³³ Polunina, *Kto est' kto*, p. 40.

⁴³⁴ D.A. Rovinskii, *Slovar' russkikh gravirovannykh portretov*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1889, (hereafter *Srgp*) vol. I, col. 50. This publication is extremely rare. An edition is listed in the British Library Catalogue but after extensive inquiries it seems to have either been lost or incorrectly shelved.

Patriarch Nikon and Tsarevna Sofia Alekseevna, who were also considered authors by Beketov. Each portrait was accompanied by a brief biographical overview, composed by Nikolai Karamzin. Although Beketov's *Pantheon* was not a commercial success,⁴³⁵ its format was repeated throughout the nineteenth century in the production of pictorial albums of well-known figures. These albums could contain portraits of national and international subjects, historical or contemporary. Most frequently, portrait collections were produced of Russian tsars, the imperial family, and military leaders; the Napoleonic Wars generated a large number of publications of this latter group. There were few publications concerned solely with writers, most notably, *Sto russkikh literatorov*, published in three volumes by A.F. Smirdin between 1839 and 1845.⁴³⁶ However, it was not until the second half of the nineteenth century that the publication of albums of public figures grew significantly. These albums, which can best be described as 'portrait-biography' albums, could vary in size and in the organization of their subjects but the basic format was the same: a single portrait accompanied by a biography. The biographies supplied with these albums were usually short (they had to cover only one page or else this would alter the lay out of the album) with brief details on the life of the subject and their major achievements or works. To appeal to the greatest number of potential purchasers the albums were often produced in small issues that contained five or so subjects and sometimes it was even possible to purchase each subject – a portrait usually accompanied by a short biographical essay – individually. There were even variations in the type of paper the portraits were printed on and the binding of the album cover. This thesis examines three examples of these albums: *A Portrait Gallery of Notable Russians (Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei)* (1865-1869),⁴³⁷ *Contemporary Notable Russians (Russkie sovremennye deiateli)* which after four volumes became *Our Notables (Nashi deiateli)* (1876-1880)⁴³⁸ and *Notable*

⁴³⁵ Polunina, *Kto est' kto*, p. 41.

⁴³⁶ Rovinskii, *Srgp*, col. 114. See also A.G. Dement'ev et al. (eds.), *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat' (1702-1894)*, Moscow, 1959, p. 287.

⁴³⁷ Published by A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1865, vol. II, 1869. This thesis is concerned with volume II. See Rovinskii, *Srgp*, col. 136.

⁴³⁸ Published by A.O. Bauman, compiled by D.I. Lobanov, *Russkie sovremennye deiateli. Sbornik portretov zamechatel'nykh lits nastoiashchago vremeni s biografichkimi ocherkami*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1876. Portraits of Turgenev, p. 57; Maikov, p. 69 and Ostrovskii, p. 101; vol. II, 1877, portraits of Nekrasov, p. 37 and Dostoevskii, p. 60; vol. III, 1878, portrait of Goncharov, p. 57; vol. IV, 1878, title changes to *Russkie byvshie deiateli*, no relevant portraits;

Russians in Portraits (Russkie deiateli v portretakh) (1882-1891).⁴³⁹ One common feature all share is the use of the term *deiateli* that deserves consideration for a moment. A modern dictionary translation of *deiatel'* is 'agent' or 'public figure'.⁴⁴⁰ Yet its use in the titles of the albums really implies more than this and the term 'notable' more accurately conveys the meaning; these were figures who quite literally were noted or celebrated by society. This is evident from the evolution of the publication *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei (Pgrd)*. *Pgrd* was issued by the lithographic workshop of A.E. Miunster, a Russian-born lithographer who had previously undertaken lithographic work for V. Timm's journal *Russian Arts Bulletin (Khudozhestvennyi listok)* (1851-62). *Pgrd* appeared in two volumes, each of which contained one hundred portraits. The first volume appeared in 1865 and contained portraits of the imperial family and state officials. The second volume is of interest to this thesis as it contained portraits of writers, artists and actors. It featured portraits of writers both living – Goncharov, Ostrovskii, Maikov, Nekrasov, Pisemskii, Turgenev – and deceased – Belinskii, Griboedov, Gogol', Pushkin, Shevchenko amongst others. The album could be purchased in a variety of ways and with a choice of two papers, either on *kitaiskii* paper or *beloi* paper (the cheaper version).⁴⁴¹ One hundred portraits with biographies including delivery and with 'careful packaging and postage' cost sixteen roubles on *beloi* paper or forty roubles on *kitaiskii* paper. If you wished to treat yourself to both volumes it was thirty roubles or seventy-five, depending on the paper selected. It was possible to purchase the biographies separately from the portraits and also to purchase each portrait individually. A portrait on *Kitaiskii* paper would cost

vol. V, 1879, the title changes to *Nashi deiateli. Galereia zamechatel'nykh liudei Rossii v portretakh i biografiakh*. Portraits of Lermontov, p. 67, Griboedov, p. 83 and Belinskii, p. 104; vol. VI, 1879, portraits of Tolstoi, p. 29; Grigorovich, p. 36 and Pisemskii, p. 56; vol. VII, 1880, portrait of Saltykov-Shchedrin, p. 97; vol. VIII, 1880, no relevant portraits. See Rovinskii, *Srgp*, col. 147-148 and O.S. Ostroi and I. Kh. Saksonova, *Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka. Izobrazitel'noe i prikladnoe iskusstvo*, St. Petersburg, 2002, p. 57.

⁴³⁹ Published by the editors of *Russkaia starina. Russkie deiateli v portretakh, gravirovannykh akademikom Lavrentiem Seriakovym*, 5 vols. St. Petersburg 1882-1890. Vol. I, portraits of Griboedov, p. 115, Pushkin, p. 119, Gogol, p. 123, Belinskii, p. 127, Shevchenko, p. 175 and Nekrasov, p. 179; vol. II, title alters to *Russkie deiateli v portretakh, izdannyykh redaktsiei istoricheskogo zhurnala 'Russkaia starina'*, 1886, portrait of Lermontov, p. 91; vol. III, 1889, portraits of Lermontov, p. 92, Aksakov, p. 97 and Tolstoi, p. 101; vol. IV, 1890, portrait of Tolstoi, p. 82; vol. V, 1890, all portraits of female members of Royal families.

⁴⁴⁰ See P. Falla et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Russian Dictionary*, Oxford, 2000, p. 100.

⁴⁴¹ *Kitaiskii* (Chinese) paper is high quality paper that is very thin but strong.

seventy-five kopecks if purchased from a shop or one rouble with postage. Portraits on *beloi* paper cost fifty kopeks (these could only be purchased directly from Miunster).⁴⁴²

The order of publication of the two volumes reflects a hierarchy of biography which existed in the nineteenth century but which was undergoing alteration.⁴⁴³ Images of individuals whose professional and personal activities had traditionally been regarded as of a lowly or dubious rank, for example actresses, became increasingly popular with the public and available for purchase.⁴⁴⁴ However, some of the portraits in *Pgrd* (1865-1869) were previously published by Miunster in 1859 in an edition which bore a similar, though more wordy, title, *A Portrait Gallery of Russian Men of Letters, Journalists, Artists and other Remarkable People* (*Portretnaia galereia russkikh literatorov, zhurnalistov, khudozhnikov i drugikh zamechatel'nykh liudei*).⁴⁴⁵ As was the case for many 'art' publications in nineteenth-century Russia, the text appeared both in Russian and French and the French title emphasised the 'famous' nature of those featured: *Galérie des portraits de célébrités Russes*. By 1865 this volume had been repackaged as *Pgrd* and included an introduction penned by Miunster himself. In it he paid homage to Beketov's publication and put forth the aims of his own volume.

In undertaking the publication *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei* we have aimed to acquaint the public with outstanding persons from all branches of civil activities, both of former times, and from the present, who have distinguished themselves by doing something useful in their field.⁴⁴⁶

⁴⁴² From the introductory essay by A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, n.p.

⁴⁴³ In 1769 the Reverend James Granger published *A Biographical History of England* which was a list of all significant historical figures and their known engraved portraits. This provided a hierarchical order for biographies and engravings as Granger's *History* placed individuals in twelve strict social groups, first were Kings, Queens, Princes and Princesses and last were 'Persons of both Sexes, chiefly of the lowest Order of People'. Writers were ranked in group 9, below 'Sons of Peers without titles [...] and those who have enjoyed inferior civil Employments' but above 'Painters, Artificers, mechanics, and all of inferior Professions, not included in the other classes.' See Hargreaves, 'Putting Faces to the Names', pp. 21-24.

⁴⁴⁴ In 1890 the New York photographer Sarony was alleged to have paid the actress Sandra Bernhardt \$10,000 for a sitting on the presumption that he would recuperate the fee from the subsequent sale of prints of her portrait. *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁴⁴⁵ For a reproduction of this title page see Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvyy*, p. 59.

⁴⁴⁶ Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II.

The introduction also had a strong patriotic tone that emphasised the importance of the Russian public being familiar with great Russians and knowing what they looked like.

We wished to give everyone the opportunity of acquiring authentic representations: both of persons which are famous to all of Russia, as well as those significant figures, who are for certain reasons however, little known. Goethe said: "I am a human, and there is nothing human alien to me" and we, in respect of ourselves, can repeat after him: *we are Russian* (Miunster's italics) *and not one Russian figure ought to be forgotten: in the same way, every depiction of a Russian figure must be greeted with as much sympathy as the usefulness of his activities deserves.*⁴⁴⁷

Miunster fostered the idea that it was almost the duty of any educated Russian to know what great Russian figures past and present looked like. As Miunster was in the business of reproducing and selling images this patriotic message also had financial benefits for himself. Yet this was more than a campaign to increase profits, Miunster's message reflects a growing interest in a growing visual culture, in which images became increasingly more available – the travelling exhibitions, the Tret'iakov Gallery, were all part of this development. At the end of the introduction Miunster acknowledged that his albums had to be 'supported' (i.e. bought) by the public but that those in a privileged position to privately own portraits of *deiateli* had a duty to support the albums by providing the images. '[...] those possessors of portraits of *deiateli* over the course of time will not fail us in allowing the reproduction of them, as satisfactory lithographs, as common property'.⁴⁴⁸ If the writer's portrait, or any of *deiateli*, is to be regarded as 'common property' does that affect the kind of portrait that is to be reproduced, does it have to have common appeal? Certainly, if we examine a selection of the portraits featured in Miunster's album there is nothing controversial or challenging in the presentation of their subjects: these are good quality lithographic prints taken from photographs made by respected studios. Figs. 62 to 65 show portraits of Maikov, Nekrasov, Ostrovskii and Pisemskii reproduced by Miunster, writers whose portraits were painted by *Peredvizhniki* and whose portraits were frequently to be found in portrait-biography albums.

⁴⁴⁷ Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II.

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid.

The portraits of Maikov, Nekrasov and Ostrovskii were all originally taken by Andrei Denier, who after Levitskii, was the best known portrait photographer in St. Petersburg and for whom Kramskoi worked as a photographic retoucher.⁴⁴⁹ Denier was, like Panov, an ‘artist-photographer’. He studied painting at the Academy of Arts before turning to photography and maintained a close link with the ‘Fine Arts’, associating with artists and being one of the first photographers to exhibit his work alongside painters at an Academy exhibition.⁴⁵⁰ However, like Panov, Denier was also a businessman, and prior to Miunster’s album, Denier produced his own in 1865, *An Album of August Personages and Well Known Individuals in Russia* (*Al’bom fotograficheskikh portretov avgusteiskikh osob i lits izvestnykh v Rossii*). This album was published over the course of a year in monthly editions of twelve portraits each and was so successful that the venture was repeated in 1866.⁴⁵¹ The portraits that appeared in Denier’s album are the ones that also appeared in Miunster’s and Elliot is quite correct in his observation that ‘Denier’s portraits of Russian celebrities represented an official view’.⁴⁵² For although Denier may have considered himself an artist, his portraits are conventional representations that aim to afford the subjects the utmost respect. The photograph of Pisemskii is by an unknown photographer⁴⁵³ but it is in keeping with the other writer portraits. All the portraits present their subjects ‘head and shoulders’ and there is no attempt to present any setting; sometimes the edge of a chair can be seen. In this respect, they have something in common with the *Peredvizhniki* portraits of the 1870s, which also placed their subjects on a plain, dark background. The presentation of these portraits without backgrounds made the process of reproduction simpler, but it also focused the viewer’s attention entirely on the ‘august personages’. Indeed, very rarely are subjects in these types of albums given any visual context, in terms of settings or accessories, as the purpose of these portraits was not to provide a work of art,

⁴⁴⁹ Kramskoi would later produce a portrait of his old employer. For details on Denier see Morozov, *Rkhf*, pp. 30-34.

⁴⁵⁰ Elliot, *Photography in Russia* p. 35.

⁴⁵¹ Ibid. See also Morozov, *Rkhf*, p. 34

⁴⁵² Elliot, *Photography in Russia*, p. 35.

⁴⁵³ On close inspection of the lithograph one can decipher on the left hand side of it ‘from photographer ?? Goka (Hoher?) and co. The history of photography in Russia is a subject that has attracted sporadic attention by scholars, although the recent works by Miroliubova and Petrova, and Shipova indicate this is changing. Unfortunately I have not been able to find any reference to this photographer in any studies nor in the Brokhaus and Efron encyclopaedia.

but rather a visual point of reference, a visual support to the accompanying biographical text.⁴⁵⁴ This point is underlined by the frequent inclusion in these albums of the subject's signatures under their portraits and this occurs in the Miunster album and in the *Russkie sovremennye deiateli* series. The reproduction of these signatures was another added feature with which to attract purchasers, but arguably it also served another purpose as a reassurance or rather guarantee to the purchaser that this was most definitely a true likeness of whoever was pictured above. As artists sign their paintings to certify their authenticity, placing subjects' signatures under their portraits publishers sent out the implicit message that the subject authenticated this portrait; this was how they wanted to be presented to their public. And who could blame them if they did? The portraits of Maikov, Nekrasov, Ostrovskii and Pisemskii present these writers as immaculately dressed, well groomed with trimmed beards and tidy hair and completely sure of themselves; confident European gentlemen. There is nothing particularly Russian about their dress, although this is also feature in the majority of the *Peredvizhniki* portraiture. More significantly, there was no attempt to try to represent something of the professional and personal identities of these men, which there was in *Peredvizhniki* portraits and, as will be seen, in some other photographic portraits. Miunster's portraits are representations in which the priority was to accurately provide the viewer with the physiognomy, appearance and details of dress of each subject, but they do not represent any more, they do not give an indication of what that subject is *like*. In the case of the portrait of Nekrasov it is especially difficult to gauge anything of the writer's personality or psyche as the writer is presented in profile, limiting the view of his facial expression.

One point that should be mentioned in relation to photographic portraits and their reproduction is the retouching or correcting of prints. It would be wrong to think of these portraits as objective images in comparison to the *Peredvizhniki* portraits; the photographer, like the artist, constructs a representation of his sitter and like the artist he can continue to amend it after the sitter has left his studio. Sergei Morozov notes that the retouching of

⁴⁵⁴ There are some exceptions to this with reference to images of deceased writers that appeared in these albums. Often these writers were presented in 'death bed' scenes. In *Russkie deiateli v*

photographs was a daily task in Denier's studio⁴⁵⁵ and we can presume that perfecting a portrait would be an even greater concern if the subject were a celebrity. These observations on Denier's/Miunster's portraits are obviously open to debate, but what is not is the fact that their albums were successful enterprises and that the public responded well to the way Russian writers, as well as other well known figures, were presented in them.⁴⁵⁶ It will not come as a surprise, therefore, that later portrait-biography albums continued to present their subjects in a similar fashion to Miunster. However, all albums had their own unique attractions and the role of the image producer should not be overlooked as a means for attracting potential purchasers.

The 1870s saw the rise of photography as a profession. Although regarded by some in the nineteenth century as a dubious occupation,⁴⁵⁷ the number of photographers working in European cities rapidly increased from the 1850s to the 1880s; by 1874 there were some one hundred and ten photographic studios in St. Petersburg⁴⁵⁸ and some practitioners – Levitskii, Denier, Panov, Bergner, amongst others - became as well known as their famous subjects. However, for most of this period engraving still provided the means for photographs and paintings to be reproduced and a number of engravers became household names in the 1860s to 1890s, largely due to their work appearing in illustrated magazines and publications.⁴⁵⁹ As well as the aforementioned I.S.

portretakh, vol. I both Pushkin and Belinskii are shown lying dead in bed. The Pushkin portrait is particularly dramatic with two large candles burning either side of the poet.

⁴⁵⁵ Morozov, *Rkhf*, p. 32.

⁴⁵⁶ Miunster's portraits continued to have appeal throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. In a 1909 catalogue *Russkie portrety, graviury i litografii*, issued by a print shop, N. Solov'ev, 51 Litenii, St. Petersburg, the Pisemskii portrait is listed (no. 438) as available at a price of thirty kopecks. Miunster was still in the publishing business in 1895 and the success of his *Portretnaia galereia* and its recognition as his firm's landmark publication is demonstrated by Miunster's entry of the second volume into the 'First All-Russian Exhibition of the Publishing industry'. See the exhibition catalogue, *Pervaia Vserossiiskaia vystavka pechatnago dela*, St. Petersburg, 1895. The Miunster firm was entered in Group III, 'Publishing Firms'.

⁴⁵⁷ 'The photographer was still often perceived as a dubious individual, at best a failed artist, at worst a shady character'. Bajac, *The Invention of Photography*, p. 67.

⁴⁵⁸ T. Petrova & G. Mioliubova, *St. Petersburg. A 300th Birthday Tribute. People and Places in Photographs around 1900. Handlist of Exhibits*, London, 2003, p. 7.

⁴⁵⁹ Engraving has a strong history in Russia, represented by both trained artists producing high quality works from the time of Peter I as well as the traditional folk-art 'lubok'. There are a number of excellent works on engraving in Russia as it is a subject that attracted scholarly attention from the nineteenth century. The most famous studies are those by the scholar and collector Rovinskii. Other excellent overviews on engraving include, V. Ia. Adariukov, *Ocherk po istorii litografii v Rossii*, St. Petersburg, 1912; E. Gollerbakh, *Istoriia graviury i litografii v Rossii*, Moscow-Petrograd, 1923; A.F. Korostin, *Russkaia litografiia*, Moscow, 1953; B. Zabolotskikh, *Russkaia graviura*, Moscow, 1993. Adariukov was one of the most prolific

Panov, other notable engravers of this period included Lavrentii Avksent'evich Seriakov (1824-1881), Ivan Petrovich Pozhalostin (1837-1909), Vasilii Vasil'evich Mate (1856-1917)⁴⁶⁰ and the French engraver Adolphe François Pannemaker (1822-1900). All these engravers produced work, including portraits, for popular illustrated magazines such as *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* and *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* and apart from Pannemaker, who was based in Paris, all also taught engraving at either the Academy of Arts or other schools such as the Baron Stieglitz Central School of Technical drawing.⁴⁶¹ Of these engravers, Seriakov was the most well known at the time; many of the younger Russian engravers, including Mate, studied under him at the Academy of Arts where Seriakov was the first Russian academician of wood engraving.⁴⁶² The Russian public became familiar with Seriakov's skill as an engraver through his work for journals, and many artists demanded that only Seriakov reproduced their works.⁴⁶³ One of the journals Seriakov worked for was *Russian Antiquity* (*Russkaia starina*)⁴⁶⁴ and he produced the majority of the portraits that appeared in the journal between 1870 and 1881.⁴⁶⁵ These portraits became Seriakov's most acclaimed works and after his death these were the focus for the first album in a series *Russkie deiateli*, issued by the publishers of *Russkaia starina*. The full title of the first volume was *Notable Russians in Portraits engraved by Academician Lavrentii Seriakov (Russkie deiateli v portretakh gravirovannykh akademikom Lavrentiem Seriakovym)*. What is special about this album was the

scholars of Russian engraving and produced countless articles and studies on individual engravers, collectors and collections.

⁴⁶⁰ Mate was born in Eidkunen, East Prussia and therefore some Russian sources give his name in the Russified form, Vasilii Vasil'evich Mate and others in the German form, Wilhelm Mathe. As the majority of the sources this thesis examines use 'Mate', we will also use the Russian form.

⁴⁶¹ Many Russian engravers, including Mate, also studied under Pannemaker in Paris, where he was professor of engraving at the Imperial School of Drawing.

⁴⁶² L. Varshavskii, *L.A. Seriakov*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1949, p. 25. There are very few works on individual engravers but this pamphlet provides a detailed review of Seriakov's career and his major works. After his death *Russkaia starina* published an article on him, N.P. Sobko, 'Zhizn' i proizvedeniia L.A. Seriakova', *Russkaia starina* (February and June 1881) and a small pamphlet was published *Lavrentii Avksent'evich Seriakov 1824-1881*, St. Petersburg, 1881 that consisted of an obituary by M. Semevskii, first appeared in *Golos*, no. 5, 1881, and a speech given by S.V. Protopopov at Seriakov's burial. This reflects the fame Seriakov attained during his career.

⁴⁶³ L. Varshavskii, *L.A. Seriakov*, p. 31.

⁴⁶⁴ *Russkaia starina* was a monthly historical journal published from 1870-1918. The journal's main interest was the documentation of letters, diaries, observations, biographies and such like belonging to Russian figures of historical importance. *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat'*, p. 532.

⁴⁶⁵ L. Varshavskii, *L.A. Seriakov*, p. 33.

belief by its publishers that it was primarily the artistic ability of Seriakov, rather than the subjects of the portraits, that would attract purchasers. This is evident from the title page which bears the heading ‘In Memory of L.A. Seriakov, died 2 January 1881’. His name appears prominently in the title; many engraved images in illustrated publications did not print the engraver’s name, although often it is possible to make out a signature. Inside the album, rather than biographies of the subjects, there is a four-page introduction on Seriakov, which rather than tell the reader about the subjects selected for inclusion, details Seriakov’s career and his work for *Russkaia starina*.⁴⁶⁶ Volume one contained nearly all the engraved portraits Seriakov produced for the journal⁴⁶⁷ in one collection, rather than present different professional groups in separate volumes; writers were placed alongside royalty and statesmen. All the writers included in the publication by 1882 were dead (Belinskii, Gogol, Griboedov, Nekrasov, Pushkin and Shevchenko) which underlined the idea that this was a tribute to both a great artist and great men no longer alive. It also reflected the nature of *Russkaia starina* which was, after all, a historical journal. One of the unique features about this first volume is that as the emphasis was on the creator of the images, the accompanying text not only described the subject but also the image itself. It explained what portrait the engraving was taken from and when it had first appeared in *Russkaia starina*. This is a rare occurrence in these albums or any illustrated publications in which, frustratingly, portraits usually accompany biographies or articles without specific mention of when the image was produced or by whom, or how it reflects the subject’s character or career. Reflections such as these seemed to be deemed unnecessary by publishers and editors, for whom the mere inclusion of a portrait was enough.

The Seriakov portrait of Nekrasov (Fig. 66) is one rarely reproduced elsewhere, and one reason for this was that in the opinions of Seriakov and the editors of *Russkaia starina*, it was not particularly good. The accompanying text explained the portrait thus:

This woodcut portrait, which is now included in this artistic collection, is a reproduction from an original photograph, taken some years ago, before the demise of Nekrasov, and it can be said to be a likeness ‘for its

⁴⁶⁶ See the introductory essay that appears at the beginning of *Russkie deiateli*, vol. I, for *Russkaia starina*’s view of their relationship with Seriakov. pp. 7-10.

⁴⁶⁷ *Russkie deiateli*, vol. I, p. 9.

time'. The portrait did not turn out successfully however, but this was not because of the engraver - the obedient hand of Seriakov did not make alterations – but because it was taken from an unsuccessful original. The photographer of this portrait convinced us that this was a good likeness of Nekrasov in the years of his illness. However, neither Seriakov nor the editor of 'R.S.' were satisfied with this portrait and it is published here for the first time, only, so to speak, in order for a complete collection dedicated to the memory of Seriakov to be presented.⁴⁶⁸

Although the initial idea of *Russkaia starina* was to produce an album dedicated to the memory of Seriakov, the success of the venture led them to produce more volumes. The second volume, which appeared in 1886, featured the work of Seriakov as well as other engravers, but the only writer's portrait to appear was one of Lermontov by Ivan Ivanovich Matiushkin, a former pupil of Seriakov's. However, by time of the third volume in 1889, all Seriakov's portraits had been made use of and volume III had the shortened title of simply *Notable Russians in Portraits (Russkie deiateli v portretakh)*. In this volume there appeared yet another portrait of Lermontov, again by Matiushkin, who also produced a portrait of S.T. Aksakov. However, the most interesting portrait is a wood engraving by V.V. Mate (another former pupil of Seriakov) taken from Kramskoi's 1873 portrait of Tolstoi (Fig. 67). This is a rare occurrence of the reproduction of the Kramskoi portrait in an illustrated publication; the only other notable example was in Sobko's illustrated catalogue to the 1882 All-Russian Exhibition.⁴⁶⁹ In the 1890s Mate produced a number of engravings based on portraits of Tolstoi by Repin⁴⁷⁰ but this earlier example of a Tolstoi portrait reproduced by Mate demonstrates the engraver's ability to reproduce the tone of a painted portrait in a wood engraving. This was not the first *Peredvizhniki* portrait Mate had reproduced; in 1880 *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* featured a full-page spread of his engraving of Perov's 1871 portrait of Ostrovskii⁴⁷¹ (Fig. 68). This engraving also featured as a free supplement to the theatrical journal *The*

⁴⁶⁸ *Russkie deiateli*, vol. I, p. 182.

⁴⁶⁹ Sobko, *Illustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki*, p. 44.

⁴⁷⁰ V. Noinov, *V.V. Mate*, Leningrad, 1927. This is a small catalogue produced by the State Russian Museum of an exhibition held in 1927 of Mate's work. It provides an overview of Mate's work and the developments in his style and techniques. It lists five 'Tolstoi' portraits by Mate based on original Repin works. Catalogue nos. 27, 29, 30, 33 and 34.

⁴⁷¹ *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 13, 22 March 1880, p. 241.

Prompter (Sufler) in 1880 and in *The Illustrated World (Illiustrirovannyi mir)* in 1886.⁴⁷²

In 1890 *Russkie deiateli* volume IV featured another portrait of Tolstoi, who in the late 1880s and 1890s became increasingly famous due to his radical social and theological beliefs as well as for his literary output. His celebrity status was to rise even more however, as in 1891 his wife persuaded the authorities to allow publication of the *The Kreutzer Sonata*, which resulted in the writer being 'deluged with letters [...] accused of immorality [...] denounced from the pulpit, threatened again with government persecution'.⁴⁷³ It seems rather perceptive of the publishers to include a portrait of Tolstoi again. This portrait in volume IV was an engraving made by the artist Fedor Aleksandrovich Merkin in 1888 (Fig. 69) and although no details were given of the original, it is highly likely it was taken from either a photograph by M.M. Panov by the Moscow studio of 'Sherer and Nabgoltz', which often photographed Tolstoi.⁴⁷⁴ Although many turn-of-the-century photographs of Tolstoi were taken at Iasnaia Poliana, especially snapshots by his wife who was a keen amateur photographer or by his disciple V.G. Chertkov, most of the earlier images of Tolstoi were taken in Moscow and St. Petersburg studios.⁴⁷⁵ One of the earliest photographs was the aforementioned group and individual shots of Tolstoi by Levitskii in 1856 and, as will be discussed, the Petersburg photographer Shapiro also photographed the writer. However, in the 1870s and 1880s Tolstoi spent more time in Moscow than Petersburg and the Sherer and Nabgoltz studio

⁴⁷² *Sufler*, 31 October 1880, *Illiustrirovannyi mir*, no.23, 1886. See G.S. Arbuzov & G.V. Stepanova (comps.), *Opisanie izobrazitel'nykh materialov Pushkinskogo doma. VI A.N. Ostrovskii*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1960, (hereafter referred to as *OPdOst*) p. 26.

⁴⁷³ E.J. Simmons, *Tolstoy*, London, 1973, p. 156.

⁴⁷⁴ See Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvy*, pp. 308-317 on Martin Nikolaevich Sherer (?-1883) and Georgii Ivanovich Nabgoltz (?-1883) who together bought K.A. Bergner's studio and business in 1863 and went on to establish their own successful Moscow photographic studio.

⁴⁷⁵ See *Tolstoi v zhizn'*. L.N. Tolstoi v fotografiakh S.A. Tolstoi i V.G. Chertkova, Tula, 1982. The earliest amateur photographs of Tolstoi date from 1887, but S.A. Tolstaia developed a real enthusiasm for photography after the death of her son in 1895 as she decided she needed a distraction. In the 1900s a whole genre of photographs of Tolstoi and his life at Iasnaia Poliana developed and were incredibly popular. These photographs were often reproduced as postcards and showed Tolstoi walking around the estate, riding a horse or simply deep in thought. A series of postcards were produced, featuring photographs of Tolstoi and Iasnaia Poliana and accompanied by quotations from Tolstoi writing. Tolstoi was a popular postcard subject since the first official postcard image of him, a portrait by Repin, was issued by the Russian Red Cross in 1899-1900. See V.P. Tret'iakov, *Otkrytie pis'ma serebriannogo veka*, St. Petersburg, 2000, p. 277. Albums were also published such as *Iasnaia Poliana. Zhizn' L.N. Tolstogo. Al'bom*,

photographed him from as early as 1868 (Fig. 70) right until the year of his death. (In later years a photographer travelled to Iasnaia Poliana). What is interesting about the Sherer and Naboltz images and can be seen in the Merkin engraving is that the writer appeared in his traditional Russian peasant blouse. Therefore, although the 1873 Kramskoi portrait established a definite 'Tolstoi-iconography', an 1868 photograph predated it in representing the writer in clothing that was to become one of the strongest elements of that iconography. The Mate and Merkin engravings that appeared in 1889 and 1890 demonstrate the growing trend of a particular 'Tolstoi-iconography' in Russian public consciousness, as prior to this portraits of Tolstoi reproduced in albums and illustrated journals presented him in smart European dress.

In total five *Russkie deiateli* volumes were produced, although volume five (1891) only contained portraits of female members of royal families. Inside the back cover of volume three the publishers of *Ruskaia starina* listed all the books and supplements issued in association with the journal since 1870 and how it was possible for readers to order these. With reference to the first *Russkie deiateli* volume it states, 'None remain, not a single copy, all completely sold out.'⁴⁷⁶ It is the same case for volume two, issued in 1886. A table reads: 'published: 2,000 copies, sold: 2,000 copies.'⁴⁷⁷ The sales figures for volume three are of course not available but the table states that the print run for this volume was increased to 2,500 copies.⁴⁷⁸ Although a print run of 2,000 or 2,500 seems insignificant compared to the sales figures of a journal such as *Niva*, which sold 55,000 copies in 1880,⁴⁷⁹ it accounts for a considerable proportion of the readers of *Ruskaia starina*, which in 1882 sold a total 5,600 copies.⁴⁸⁰ There was no indication of prices on the editions of volumes one-three that were examined for this thesis but on the back cover of volume four the price was stated as three roubles, or one rouble for subscribers of *Ruskaia starina*.

ispolnennyi foto-tinto graviuroi, c. 1910. This was a collection of loose pages mostly of photographs taken of the writer after 1908 and a number of these were taken by Chertkov.

⁴⁷⁶ *Russkie deiateli v portretakh*, vol. III, 1889, p. XVII.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷⁹ *Ruskaia periodicheskaia pechat'*, p. 530. *Niva* was of course a weekly journal and these were one-off albums. *Niva* was also much better 'value for money'; a yearly subscription in 1876 for a reader in St. Petersburg without postage was 4 roubles, with postage 5 roubles. Information taken from advertisement placed on front cover of *Niva*, no.1, 3 January 1876.

⁴⁸⁰ *Russkie deiateli v portretakh*, vol. III, 1889, p. XV.

The initial motivation of *Russkaia starina*'s editors was to produce an album which chronicled the talent of Seriaikov, but the publisher of the journal *Neva*,⁴⁸¹ A.O. Bauman, had no interest in publicising either the photographers or the engravers who executed the portraits that appeared in his portrait-biography albums: *Contemporary Notable Russians. A Collection of Portraits of Remarkable Persons of the Present Day* (*Russkie sovremennye deiateli. Sbornik portretov zamechatel'nykh lits nastoiashchago vremeni*) appeared in eight volumes from 1876-1880, with twelve portraits in each volume. In 1879 with the publication of the fourth volume the title changed somewhat and took on a more informal tone and became *Our Notables. A Gallery of Remarkable Russian People in Portraits and Biographies* (*Nashi deiateli. Galereia zamechatel'nykh liudei Rossii v portretakh i biografiakh*). Rovinskii states that the portraits were steel-plate engravings executed in Leipzig.⁴⁸² From this we can surmise that they were the work of the F.A Brokhaus printing firm, earlier discussed in reference to Turgenev. The Turgenev portrait that appears in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli* vol. I (Fig. 71) is somewhat different to the other Brokhaus portrait (Fig. 57). In the latter, Turgenev is face on, whereas in the former he is slightly at angle, he is also wearing different jackets; one is double breasted, the other single. However, on close inspection of the two portraits it is clear that they were produced using the same techniques and both of them present us with similarly 'standard' images of the writer.

The construction of the albums was similar to Miunster's and *Russkaia starina*'s. The first volume began with a very short forward, unsigned but presumably by Bauman or Lobanov, and each featured subject was presented in a one page portrait and accompanied by a biographical essay of a few pages. Also, the signature of each subject was printed underneath whenever possible, as an added feature and as proof of authenticity. Writers appeared sporadically in this album series but those that were afforded an entry were the core figures who featured in other albums and in *Peredvizhniki* portraits: Turgenev, Maikov, Ostrovskii (volume I), Nekrasov and Dostoevskii (volume II), Goncharov

⁴⁸¹ Not be confused with *Niva*, *Neva* was a weekly journal published by A.O. Bauman in St. Petersburg from 1879. It was originally published under the title *Illiustrirovannaia nedelia* (1873-1876) and then *Illiustrirovannaia gazeta* (1876-78) before changing to *Neva. Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat'*, p. 556.

⁴⁸² Rovinskii, *Srgp*, vol. II, col.147.

(volume III), Tolstoi, Grigorovich and Pisemskii (volume VI) and Saltykov-Shchedrin (volume VII). All the portraits of contemporaries were engravings taken from photographs and there is nothing particularly remarkable about these images of remarkable people. The original photographs were taken by a variety of studios, and like the engravers they were not acknowledged. Some can be easily identified. For example, the portrait of Nekrasov is clearly taken from the photograph taken by Levitskii in the early 1870s (Figs. 72 & 73); one can just make out the cigarette in Nekrasov's right hand. Dostoevskii's portrait, in which the writer appears relatively healthy and well, was taken by the St. Petersburg photographer, N. Doss in 1876 (Fig. 74).⁴⁸³ As well as being reproduced here the Doss portrait was also issued as a *carte-de-visite* and a cabinet print.⁴⁸⁴ In the twentieth century, along with the Perov portrait and Panov photograph it was one of the most reproduced portraits of Dostoevskii, appearing in collected images of his works and in editions of *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*. Dostoevskii obviously cared for his depiction in this photograph, as it was this portrait he presented to friends and acquaintances.⁴⁸⁵ The Ostrovskii portrait was taken by a less well known Moscow photographer, Nikolai Pavlovich Panin (1851-?)⁴⁸⁶ in 1875 (Fig. 75).⁴⁸⁷ Head and shoulders compositions, their subjects are all smartly dressed, including Tolstoi (Fig 76). Tolstoi's appearance in volume VI again demonstrates the existence of two strands of visual representations of this particular writer in the 1870s and 1880s. The appearance of Tolstoi in the two *Russkaia starina* albums in Russian dress indicates that by the end of the 1880s this particular Tolstoi iconography was gaining precedence, at a time when the writer's reputation in Russia was also undergoing alteration and he was

⁴⁸³ Doss is a photographer that has received little, if any attention and about whom it proved difficult to discover biographical or professional information. *Peterburgskii al'bom* reproduces a few of his photographs and reproduces a reverse of one of them that gives his studio name and address. p. 282.

⁴⁸⁴ *MnpFMD*, entry nos. 3113 and 3114, pp. 244-245. A 'cabinet' photograph, or print, was a development on the *carte-de-visite*. Like a *carte-de-visite* the print was mounted on card but it was considerably larger, measuring approximately 11x17 cm. Its name derives from the fact it was suitable for display in a cabinet. It was introduced at the end of the 1860s and proved a highly popular format. See Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvyy*, p. 20 for a table showing the sizes photographs were produced in 1890.

⁴⁸⁵ A. Ivanov-Natov, *Ikonografiia F.M. Dostoevskogo*, pp. 59-61. A number of variants of this photograph are reproduced by Ivanov-Natov including a copy Dostoevskii presented to his wife in 1880. p. 60.

⁴⁸⁶ Shipova, *Fotografy Moskvyy*, p. 231.

⁴⁸⁷ See *OPdOst*, entry no. 62, p. 25.

emerging as a commentator on religion and philosophy as well as a famous author. In general, Tolstoi's fame was increasing internationally and it seems there was a consciousness move by image producers and publishers to present Tolstoi in this costume, it became an intrinsic part of his identity in public consciousness and a definite way of identifying the writer in portraits, however poor the depiction of his facial features might be.

Rovinskii does not discuss the portraits at great length, but he does remark on their value for money if one was a subscriber to *Neva*. 'Subscribers of the publication *Neva* could acquire all of the above (i.e. all ninety-six portraits) for the extremely cheap price of eight roubles.'⁴⁸⁸ Bauman's albums were also different in that they did not initially feature portraits of past leaders and celebrities, only those of the present day. The reason for the change in title after vol. III is indicated by the contents; the albums started to feature celebrities of former times. Bauman and his company obviously realised they were missing a potential market if they did not include portraits of the likes of Lermontov and Griboedov, who both appeared in volume five. Indeed, one can understand why Rovinskii, recording the work in his dictionary, simply noted that some of the portraits are 'sometimes not too bad'⁴⁸⁹. There is nothing remarkable about the representation of the writers in Bauman's albums and that is where their significance lies. They demonstrate that the vast majority of writers' portraits in printed form aimed to provide accurate physical likenesses of their subjects but did not aspire to much more.

One portrait-biography album that did aspire to be much more was K.A. Shapiro's *A Portrait Gallery of Russian Men of Letters, Scholars and Artistes* (*Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, i artistov*) (Fig. 77).⁴⁹⁰ Compared to his contemporaries, Shapiro has received even less scholarly attention, although he photographed most of Russia's best known writers, members of the Imperial family and even received the title of Photographer to the Imperial Academy of Arts.⁴⁹¹ If Shapiro is at all remembered today it is as a photographer, but the other passion in his life, perhaps his true passion, was

⁴⁸⁸ Rovinskii, *Srgp*, vol. II, col.148.

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁰ K.A. Shapiro, *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, i artistov s biografiami i faksimilie*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1880.

⁴⁹¹ Elliot, *Photography in Russia*, p. 37.

literature; his entry in the Brokhaus and Efron encyclopaedia lists his literary activities as much as his photographic ones.⁴⁹² Shapiro's love of the written word was reflected in his photography. One of his most outstanding achievements was an album based upon Gogol's *Diary of a Madman* (*Zapiski sumasshedshego*) (1835). This album, published in 1883, was one of the first 'theatrical-albums' and pictured the actor Vasilii Andreev-Burlak (1843-1888) in poses based on Poprishchev's (the madman) monologue; each photograph 'captures a definitive moment of the hero's condition and actions'.⁴⁹³

Although *Diary of a Madman* may have been Shapiro's greatest achievement in terms of the artistry of photography and pushing the boundaries of photography, what concerns this thesis is his work of a more commercial nature and which drew criticism, rather than praise, from some commentators. Shapiro was one of the most prolific photographers of Russian writers in the late 1870s and 1880s. Testimony to this is his 1880 album, issued in two parts, *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh i artistov*. This album included portraits of Goncharov, Dostoevskii, Nekrasov, Saltykov-Shchedrin and Turgenev in volume one and Ostrovskii, Pisemskii and Tolstoi in volume two (Figs. 78 to 85). The way in which this album presented the writers demonstrates the insight Shapiro must have had into his potential market. The album not only provided the purchaser with a collection of portraits, it gave them with luxury item, a consumer desirable of which the portraits were only one part. As we previously saw, Bauman added to the 'gallery' nature of a number of his albums by placing the portraits in a kind of frame. Shapiro went a stage further and placed his photographic prints in large, intricately patterned frames that drew attention as much as the portraits. Shapiro wrote an introductory piece 'From the Editor' ('*Ot izdatelia*') to each of the volumes and

⁴⁹² Brokhaus and Efron, *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* tom. XXXIX, St. Petersburg, 1903, p. 164.

⁴⁹³ Elliot *Photography in Russia*, p. 36. The album consisted of thirty albumen prints 14.4 x 10 cm. Four of these are reproduced in *Photography in Russia*, p. 108 and one can understand why they received so much attention; they could be stills from an early cinematic film and Morozov states that the album should be seen as an early precursor to film making, as it is the first Russian example of 'playing' on film. Morozov, *Rkhf*, p. 44. According to Morozov, the album generated discussion in the European, as well as the Russian press. V.V. Stasov certainly believed it a significant international achievement and commented upon it in *Novosti*, 11 April 1883. Reproduced in V.V. Stasov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. III, 1894, pp. 1499-1504. For details and a discussion of Shapiro's *Diary of a Madman* see Elliot, *Photography in Russia*, pp. 36, 108, 229-230 and Morozov, *Rkhf*, pp. 42-44. Shapiro is not mentioned in *Peterburgskii al'bom*. One can

in volume one he made much of the 'frames'. 'The portraits are framed with elegant borders in an ancient Russian Style; this decoration is taken from a manuscript of a petition to tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, belonging to the Imperial Public Library and reproduced here for the first time.'⁴⁹⁴ By surrounding the photographs with this medieval frame Shapiro did more than make his publication picturesque, he associated these writers with Russian history and adds weight to their visual significance, almost presenting them as historical documents of the future. Shapiro's chosen design also reflects wider trends in artistic taste; patterns and motifs derived from pre-Petrine sources had been fashionable for a number of years. Indeed, in the 1880s and 1890s Russian art, particularly applied art, would play an important role as a means for Russians to explore and define their national identity. The last two decades of the nineteenth century saw continual economic and social developments in Russian society and Shapiro's album can be seen to be testament to this. Not only do the photographs represent technological advancements, but the use of national designs indicate the re-evaluation Russia was making of her past and its relevance to her present condition.

Besides these frames the construction of the album was similar to most portrait-biography albums; each portrait was accompanied by a biographical essay of one page in length, none of which commented on the portraits but provided a concise overview of the life and career of each subject. Underneath each image appeared the subject's signature and the date the photograph was taken - authorising the authenticity of the image. All the photographs were taken in 1879, apart from the Pisemskii portrait which was taken in 1880 and the Nekrasov portrait, which was not actually Shapiro's work. The inclusion of the Nekrasov portrait is indicative of the commercial ambitions of the album, rather than the artistic ones. It would seem surprising that a photographer of Shapiro's standing would want to include an example of someone else's work, especially when all the other images are his own. Shapiro must have been of the opinion that the potential commercial appeal of a Nekrasov portrait outweighed the imbalance of including another studio's work. Or, to consider it another way, his

only presume that as the book is based upon the photographic collection of the Hermitage, the museum does not hold many examples of Shapiro's work.

⁴⁹⁴ Shapiro, 'Ot izdatelia' *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov*, vol. I.

album would be considered incomplete without a portrait of Nekrasov. Comparing it to the other portraits it does not seem out of place, it is in the same sepia tones, although the pose of Nekrasov is different to the presentation of the other writers who are shown face on. Shapiro handled the inclusion of the portrait with great aplomb and proudly stated that ‘All the portraits, which serve as the foundation to this gallery, were taken from life (i.e. the subjects sat for Shapiro) excluding, unfortunately, the portrait of Nekrasov which, due to the death of the poet, was taken from a cabinet photograph and is therefore not my own work’.⁴⁹⁵ Shapiro does not say whose work it is, but earlier seems to justify his inclusion of this Nekrasov portrait whilst summarizing his selection of subjects.

In this first edition of the ‘Gallery’ are included the following of our famous writers: Goncharov, Dostoevskii, Nekrasov and Turgenev. Their appearance in the world of letters occurred almost simultaneously in the 1840s and yet they have not left the stage of public activity, apart from Nekrasov, who although no longer with us, the memory of whom is still strongly alive in society.⁴⁹⁶

Shapiro seems to imply that he had no choice but to include a portrait of Nekrasov; he merely responded to public demand. The photograph he chose to reproduce appears to be one originally taken by Levitskii in 1871-72 and which also appeared in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli* vol. II, 1877 (Fig. 73).⁴⁹⁷ The introduction emphasised the idea that Shapiro was serving the public by producing the album, that he was responding to a real need.

In undertaking the photographic publication ‘Portrait Gallery of Russian Men of Letters, Scholars and Artists’ the publisher had in mind the following aim: to satisfy the natural wish in every educated man – to possess portraits of the most prominent figures in contemporary society.⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹⁵ Shapiro, ‘Ot izdatelia’, *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov*.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁷ Levitskii’s photograph is reproduced in *Peterburgskii al’bom*, p. 199. It was also chosen as the front piece to the memorial publication A. Golubev (comp.), *Nikolai Alekseevich Nekrasov: biografiia, kriticheskii obzor poezii, sobranie stikhotvorenii, posviashchennykh pamiati poeta, svod statei o N.A. Nekrasove s 1840 goda*, St. Petersburg, 1878. Unusually for a publication of its time it considered the visual representation of Nekrasov and included a list of published portraits of Nekrasov. It also commented on the inclusion of the Levitskii photograph and unlike Shapiro, credited the photographer. ‘We wished to provide this book with a true and artistically executed portrait of N.A. Nekrasov. For this part we give most definite thanks to the kind photographer S.L. Levitskii, who let us have free of charge a negative [...] the original was taken between 1871-72, a time when Nekrasov was still healthy. A. Golubev, ‘Predislovie’.

⁴⁹⁸ Shapiro, ‘Ot izdatelia’, *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov*.

Therefore, the implication was if you did not desire to own Shapiro's album you were not educated, and if you had bothered to buy the album then you were obviously of an intellectual turn of mind. But surely albums such as Miuntser's and Seriakov's already fulfilled this need? According to Shapiro, this was a mistaken belief.

Existing lithographic publications of a similar type cannot fully answer this need: lithographs rarely succeed in communicating the nature, especially the expression of a face. Photographs in contrast, these at the present time are almost the only, or in any case the best means, to attain a portrait of the greatest possible likeness of the original.⁴⁹⁹

The price of the album is reasonable when compared to others we have examined, considering it was far more ornate and of a bigger size; each volume cost five roubles. However, for the more discerning consumer it was possible to purchase the album in 'a folder with elegant gold decoration' for one extra rouble. Shapiro rather humbly states in the introduction to the first volume 'If the publisher has anticipated correctly the needs of the public, he will endeavour to see his publication through to the end. In the next edition he prepares to provide portraits other famous Russian men of letters and journalists, scholars and artistes.'⁵⁰⁰ Shapiro obviously did anticipate the needs of the public as the introduction to the second edition, less humbly, included the following details.

The success of the first edition of the 'Gallery' surpassed all our expectations: in the course of two months all copies of the publication were sold, a total of eight hundred copies. This gave us confidence that the presentation of the present second edition would be met by the public cheerfully and with the same attention.⁵⁰¹

Eight hundred copies is a fairly limited print run, but even so, the album received some critical appraisal and was reviewed in *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal*. However, the opinions of *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal* were not as 'cheerful' as those of Shapiro's customers.

Mr Shapiro's publication has already been extolled more than once in newspapers and even in journals. This publication, of course, does have a value on account of the appearance in it of portraits of persons, who

⁴⁹⁹ Shapiro, 'Ot izdatelia', *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov*.

⁵⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁰¹ Shapiro, 'Ot izdatelia' *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov*, vol. II.

have social significance; but as regards its own artistic worth it is quite unsatisfactory. Mr Shapiro's photographs are weak, cleaned up, retouched, and have something of a conflicting nature; they are a *bonbonnière* (*bonbon'erochnyi*) young faces appear old in these photographs, and old, in contrast, appear young [...] For true lovers of art these portraits will hardly have a soul.⁵⁰²

Shapiro was known as a photographer who excessively retouched photographs⁵⁰³ and with regards to his 'gallery' the retouching of the photographs is clearly evident in some cases. For example, Ostrovskii's face is smooth and wrinkle free (Fig. 83) compared to his portrait in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli* vol. I (Fig. 75); the writer seems to have reversed the ageing process. Shapiro's Ostrovskii portrait was taken up by the Vezenberg and Co. company and reproduced as a *vizitka*⁵⁰⁴ but it was not received well by all. The newspaper *Novoe vremia* expressed a rather unfavourable reaction to Shapiro's album and the Ostrovskii portrait in particular. So much so that it drove Ostrovskii to write the following letter to Shapiro.

Dear Mr Konstantin Aleksandrovich ! ... I found the opinion of *Novoe vremia* unfair [...] About the portraits in your 'gallery' I honestly cannot regard them other than with the greatest of praise. A photograph is not a painting; it transmits the expression of a face in a given minute; to be sure the photograph is not at fault, but myself. I am an ill and nervous person, it often happens that I do not look like myself. All the same, [...] I favourably declare that your photograph is a good likeness of me.⁵⁰⁵

However, one of Ostrovskii's friends and fellow writer Pisemskii, who was also featured, was of a different opinion and informed Shapiro about the many faults he found with the 'Gallery' after he received his complementary copy.

With regards to the portraits in your publication, I will frankly give you my opinion of them: the portraits of Grigorovich and Polonskii are good, though I haven't seen one or the other for a long time and cannot judge to what extent the portraits resemble the originals. But you didn't have any luck with the portrait of Ostrovskii and I'm extremely surprised how it could happen; that card that you sent earlier to Ostrovskii which he showed me was perfect but in the second copy there was something else that appeared, why did you elongate his face so much? Count Tolstoi in my opinion, is also quite bulky and has such a dishevelled beard, which is quite unlikely for him to have in real life. As for my portrait it carries

⁵⁰² 'Portretnaia galereiia', *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal*, vol. I, 1881, p. 36.

⁵⁰³ Morozov, *Rkhf*, p. 42.

⁵⁰⁴ *OPdOst*, entry no. 37, p. 18.

⁵⁰⁵ Ostrovskii-Shapiro, 29 April 1880, quoted in *OPdOst*, entry no. 37, p. 19.

imperfections which appear in all photographs of me and which depend of course on my inability to sit properly; in all photographs my eyes come out somewhat protruding, frightened and even somewhat mad maybe because when I do sit down in front of the camera I do not feel fear, but a great anxiety: you would have done well if you could have asked your photographic retoucher to soften my gaze which in quiet moments is completely different.⁵⁰⁶

Unfortunately for Pisemskii his comments regarding his own appearance seem justified, and his portrait (Fig. 84) was either subjected to too much alteration or not nearly enough. Pisemskii and Ostrovskii's comments on Shapiro's album concentrate on the personal identity of the sitters. Ostrovskii almost paraphrases Dostoevskii's statement that a 'person does not always look like himself', and for Ostrovskii this is reflected in Shapiro's photograph; this is a photograph of Ostrovskii, but one of the writer not looking himself! Pisemskii, too, blames himself for his portrait, if had not been so anxious, then he would have looked himself, as he does in 'quiet moments'. However, the visual representation of these writers is not their own construction, but the construction of others – the painter or photographer and the opinion of the writer of whether they look like themselves, is not as significant as whether an audience consider they look like themselves. But could this audience really know what Pisemskii or Ostrovskii looked like? The demand placed on photography, and engraving for that matter, for the reproduction of a good physical likeness above all else is understandable. *Cartes-de-visite*, frontispieces in books, portraits in illustrated journals were all aimed at a general reader or consumer who, apart from visiting exhibitions or galleries in which portraits were on display, would have no other opportunity to know what their favourite writer looked like. Some inhabitants of Moscow and St. Petersburg might see writers at meetings or events, such as the 1880 Pushkin Celebration, but would rarely have the chance to actually meet them. If they did, they may share the experience of V.M. Sikevich who was shocked on first meeting Ostrovskii in 1865.

Up until then (1865) I had never met Ostrovskii and I only knew what he looked like from photographs and was therefore perplexed when the original appeared greatly dissimilar from his *kartochki*. In the latter he appeared ordinary and with a good nature, a somewhat happy

⁵⁰⁶ Pisemskii-Shapiro, 20 April 1880, quoted in M.K. Kleman & A.P. Mogilianskii (eds.), *Literaturnyi Arkhiv: A.F. Pisemskii. Pis'ma*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936, p. 461.

disposition, moreover in terms of facial hair, the main feature was his luxurious side whiskers, descending into a small beard; besides from the photograph it was possible to conclude, that Aleksandr Nikolaevich was a brunette. Yet, here (in person) he appeared serious, somewhat scowling with a rather large ginger beard.⁵⁰⁷

If one could only compare printed images with one another, then it seems that the fundamental need of such an image was not only to look like the subject, but also to look like other established images of the subject, to be accepted into an existing visual context for that particular individual. I would argue however, that painted portraits could be regarded as both part of this context and exist outside it. Painted portraits were a more prestigious form of visual representation and were recognized to operate on a higher level than photographs. Therefore, although Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii is quite different from any photograph of the writer, both the portrait and photographs of the writer were published in the 1880s and 1890s, they existed alongside one another and were not seen as conflicting representations, but rather representations that served different purposes. A photograph and the images that derived from it, principally showed people what a writer looked like and Shapiro was criticised for interfering with this purpose. A portrait however was meant to be able to capture something of the inner qualities of the subject, their emotion and psyche, and this is reflected in the reviews of portraits we have looked at. Within a writer's visual context there could be more than one iconography that placed emphasis on different identities. This is the case with Tolstoi, Nekrasov, and to a lesser extent Ostrovskii. Tolstoi appears simultaneously in the 1870s and the 1880s, as we have discussed, in both European and Russian dress. Nekrasov has alongside the standard portraits of him - in this we include Kramskoi's 1877 head and shoulders portrait – portraits that reflect his illness and these include Kramskoi's *Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs* 1877-78 and a photograph by William Carrick. Although the painting, *Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs* is a more dramatic image of the writer, I found no contemporary reproductions of it. Instead, Kramskoi's portrait, a far simpler composition, was reproduced through engravings a number of times and was most successful. The portrait was engraved by I.P.

⁵⁰⁷ V.M. Sikevich, quoted in *OPdOst*, p.14.

Pozhalostin on the orders of *Otechestvennye zapiski* and appeared in the August 1878 edition in a print run of eight thousand copies. In July of the following year the Pozhalostin engraving was issued again in a run of seven thousand copies, a supplement to *Russkaia starina*; impressive figures for a print run in the 1870s.⁵⁰⁸ Kramskoi also produced a drawing of the portrait himself that appeared as a lithograph in the journal *Light (Svet)* in March 1878 (Fig. 86). The Kramskoi portrait was a successful portrait in terms of reproduction; it was not only a simple image, it corresponded to the other representation of him that existed in journals and *vizitki*. As well as *vizitki* there were other affordable means by which one could acquire a writer's portrait. Two of the most transient ways were as part of a *kalendar*, which were issued by publishing firms annually or through the purchase of a consumer item such as cigarettes or chocolate.

Kalendari

The publication of *kalendari* by private printing firms was granted in 1865; previously it had been the privilege of the Imperial Academy of Sciences. *Kalendari* were almanacs that could contain every possible kind of useful information for the modern nineteenth-century Russian - dates of religious holidays, facts on Russian cities and their distances from Moscow and St. Petersburg, train timetables, postal services, maps, directories of shops and services, in short, they were an inventory of contemporary urban life. They often contained reviews of the past year's events and short overviews of Russian history and cultural life. *Kalendari* produced from the 1880s onwards usually featured illustrations and portraits of well known figures, particularly members of the imperial family. One of the most successful Russian publishers of the nineteenth century, I.D Sytin, realized the publishing opportunity that *kalendari* presented and produced various *kalendari* for a mass readership, he believed they should be cheap, elegant, and accessible.⁵⁰⁹ An example of an illustrated *kalendar* from the early 1880s is the *Pictorial Everyday Almanac (Zhivopisnyi*

⁵⁰⁸ Iu. Krasovskii, 'Nekrasovskii portret raboty I.P. Pozhalostin', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 53-54, 1949, pp. 193-196.

⁵⁰⁹ I.D. Sytin, *Zhizn' dlia knigi*, Moscow, 1962, p. 68. The development of *kalendari* by the Sytin firm is covered in this book. Although it is purported to be Sytin's autobiography, McReynolds states it is of 'questionable authorship', *The News Under Russia's Old Regime*, p. 172. Brooks comments on the cheapness of Sytin's publications and how he undercut his competitors. *When Russian Learned to Read*, p. 99.

obikhodnyi kalendar')⁵¹⁰ for 1882. In a small section of obituaries of *Russkie deiateli* two small portraits of Dostoevskii and Pisemskii are printed in the centre of the page.⁵¹¹ The portraits are small, fairly crude zincographs,⁵¹² but it is clear who they are. Although no artists are credited, if we compare these portraits to the photographs of Dostoevskii and Pisemskii in Shapiro's 1880 album it would seem that these images are taken from Shapiro's original photographs. As well as *Zhivopisnoe obikhodnyi* and *Vseobshii kalendar'* a portrait of Dostoevskii also appeared in *Kalendar' krestnyi*.⁵¹³ Although the death of a writer resulted in a publication deluge of their portraits, as *kalendari* developed in the 1880s, their literary sections widened and offered readers small potted histories of Russian literature and biographies of the most celebrated writers. In 1887 Sytin produced the *Illustrated Literary Almanac (Literaturnyi illiustrirovannyi kalendar')*,⁵¹⁴ which, as its name suggests, contained an extensive section on Russian literature. It included poems, short essays and obituaries. The previous year had seen the death of a number of figures from Russian intellectual and literary life including I.S. Aksakov and Ostrovskii whose obituary was accompanied by a reproduction of the 1879 photograph by Shapiro.⁵¹⁵ Other writers included Turgenev, in an engraving of the 1880 Panov photograph,⁵¹⁶ Tolstoi, in a photograph probably taken by Sherer and Nabgoltz circa 1885⁵¹⁷ and Dostoevskii, in what is possibly an engraving of the 1876 Doss photograph.⁵¹⁸ In this *kalendar'* Sytin did not credit any engravers or photographers and the images are not commented upon in any way. This remained the case for future *kalendari* issued by the Sytin firm. In 1889 he

⁵¹⁰ *Zhivopisnyi obikhodnyi kalendar'*, St. Petersburg, 1882, published by Maximilian Jacobson.

⁵¹¹ *Zhivopisnyi obikhodnyi kalendar'*, p. 57. The Dostoevskii portrait is listed in *MnpFMD*, entry no. 3164, p. 248.

⁵¹² Zincography is the same as lithography except the former is drawn on zinc and the later on stone. Griffiths, *Prints and Printmaking*, p. 155.

⁵¹³ *Kalendar' krestnyi na 1882*, Moscow, 1881, published by A. Gattsuk. The National Library of Russia hold this item but unfortunately the pages on which portraits appeared have been removed! See *MnpFMD*, entry no. 3167, p. 248.

⁵¹⁴ It would appear this *kalendar'* was only produced for 1887. The National Library of Russia, which has complete runs of most *kalendari*, only holds an edition for 1887 and there is no indication in the catalogue that subsequent *kalendari* in this series followed.

⁵¹⁵ *Literaturnyi illiustrirovannyi kalendar'*, Moscow, 1887, pp. 150-151.

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 59.

⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 65. Tolstoi sat for Sherer and Noboltz in 1885.

⁵¹⁸ *Literaturnyi illiustrirovannyi kalendar'*, p. 77. See *MnpFMD*, entry no. 3199, p. 250 but no engraver or photographer is listed.

published the first issue of his *Obshchepoleznyy kalendar'*⁵¹⁹ which cost a mere 30 kopecks. It contained the usual facts and figures but also provided readers with a considerable *Literaturnyi otdel* that comprised small biographies of Russia's best known writers from Kantemir until 1890. Portraits of the writers featured on every page, sometimes leaving little room for the text. The portraits were what you might expect from a thirty-kopeck publication and were zincographs, of what appear to be poor quality engravings. In the reproduction of Tropinin's portrait of Pushkin,⁵²⁰ the unfortunate writer's eyes have a glassy stare (Fig. 87). As well as Tropinin's portrait of Pushkin, this *kalendar'* makes use of a number of portraits we have already come across. For example, a portrait of Aksakov⁵²¹ was based on the 1859 Bergner photograph and from which it seems all Aksakov portraits derive. Turgenev appears again,⁵²² in a portrait copied from the 1880 Panov photograph. As we have seen, Sytin previously published this portrait in the 1887 *Literaturnyi illiustrirovannyi kalendar'*. Engravings or prints taken from this photograph were reproduced in Turgenev's *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 1883 and on the front cover of *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 3 September 1883, edged in a black frame (Fig. 56). *Obshchepoleznyy kalendar'* 1890 also printed a portrait of Ostrovskii,⁵²³ taken from an 1884 photograph by Panov, which was also the basis for the portrait front piece in volume IX of *Sochineniia A.N. Ostrovskago*. Their portrait of Nekrasov⁵²⁴ was taken from an original photograph by the St. Petersburg photographer Karl (Carlo) Bergamasco (1830-1896). Bergamasco's portrait was 'pirated' by the 'Vezenberg and Co.' studio (Fig. 59) and was also reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, engraved by Seriakov.⁵²⁵ Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii was featured and by 1890 it had been reproduced a number of times, perhaps the most recognizable of the *Peredvizhniki* writer portraits. Saltykov-Shchedrin's prominence, taking up more space than any of his

⁵¹⁹ *Obshchepoleznyy kalendar'* na 1890, Moscow, 1889, published by I.D. Sytin. This series of *kalendar'* would run until 1918.

⁵²⁰ 'Literaturnyi otdel', *Obshchepoleznyy kalendar'* na 1890, Moscow, 1889, p. 92.

⁵²¹ Ibid., p. 95.

⁵²² Ibid., p. 96.

⁵²³ Ibid., p. 97.

⁵²⁴ Ibid.

⁵²⁵ This particular portrait appeared in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* twice in short succession. Firstly, 30 April 1877, p. 348 and following the writer's death on 27 December 1877, 8 January 1878, p. 32.

contemporaries, was doubtless due to the fact he had recently passed away (Fig. 88). It is only when one considers a large number of portraits from a variety of sources that it becomes clear how these images were disseminated through various methods of reproduction and to various standards. A wider range of readers, from the purchaser of the limited edition original Shapiro album, to those who could spare a few kopecks for a *kalendar'*, all had the opportunity to become familiar with the same visual representation of Dostoevskii (or Pisemskii) and therefore, a visual context for that writer became established in the wider Russian public consciousness.

The commercial use of the writer's portrait will be examined in greater detail with reference to Pushkin in 1899. However, Pushkin was not the only writer to appear on packaging. Fig. 89 is a chocolate box lid that shows Pushkin alongside Lermontov and Gogol. Although she does not examine the topic in detail, Sally West in her doctoral thesis *Constructing Consumer Culture*, addresses the use of writers' portraits on cigarette cartons, perhaps the most disposable forms of image reproduction. Cigarettes, West rightly points out, were one of the few commodities available and bought by members of all social and economic groups, yet she argues advertisers 'kept literary allusions for the workers and peasants to the folk variety, rather than evocations of Pushkin and Lermontov.'⁵²⁶ Writers, she claims, only adorned the cartons of the more expensive cigarettes, - except Tolstoi who appeared on both the cheap and more expensive brands. This does seem to be the case; cartons decorated with Pushkin usually cost six kopeks for ten cigarettes or fifteen kopeks for twenty-five, whereas cheap cigarettes at the end of the nineteenth century could cost three kopeks for a pack of ten.⁵²⁷ However, that does not mean that members of lower social and economic groups were not exposed to representations of Pushkin, merely they could not possess Pushkin, the commodity his portrait adorned or more implicitly, the lifestyle his image alluded to. But even the more expensive makes of cigarettes were available to a greater number of people than a lavish portrait-biography album. West examines some cartons produced around the turn of the nineteenth century, and the portraits reproduced on the cartons 'The

⁵²⁶ S. West, *Constructing Consumer Culture: Advertising in Imperial Russia to 1914* (Ph.D. dissertation), Urbana, Illinois, 1995, p. 241.

⁵²⁷ Ibid., p. 220.

Glory of Russia' (*Slava Rossii*) manufactured by the tobacco firm Asmolov, are similar to those to be found in the expensive albums and in the illustrated journals.⁵²⁸ An image on something as small as a cigarette packet has to be instantly recognizable to the consumer and so the portrait of Nekrasov that appeared on Asmolov's packaging derived from the photograph originally taken by Bergasmasco and reproduced in so many other locations. I do not believe that the inclusion of writers' portraits on decorative packaging trivializes their position or status in Russian society. Of course, these were items that were more likely to be thrown away and destroyed than cherished and kept, but the association of writers with a brand called 'The Glory of Russia' demonstrates the exalted status these men had in nineteenth century Russian society. It also shows that their images had become familiar enough amongst members of that society for a company to believe that the reproduction of them would aid their product.

This first part of the thesis has attempted to offer an overview of the ways in which writers were presented to the Russian public in the 1870s to 1890s. Both painted portraits and those produced through printing and photomechanical processes contributed to the position of the writer in Russian society and the Russian reading public could not help but be involved in the reception of these representations; through reading an exhibition review, visiting a gallery, seeing a portrait on the front cover of a journal, on the inside of a book, collecting a series of biographies, or even visiting the confectionery shop – writers' portraits had become an integral part of Russian visual culture by the 1890s. However, in all types of portraits symbols of the writers' professional and national identities, such as pens and papers or items of traditional Russian costume were rare, except of course in the case of Tolstoi. Rather, the aim of those in the business of image creation and reproduction was a portrait of the writer when he both 'looked like himself' and like a writer – a good physical likeness combined with the representation of the strength of the subject's intellectual and creative capabilities, the most successful example of this was Perov's portrait of Dostoevskii, in contrast the representation of Turgenev's

⁵²⁸ West, *Constructing Consumer Culture*, pp. 241-243.

physical appearance always seemed to thwart any attempt to present him as the creator of works such as *Fathers and Children*.

Through the reproduction of writers' portraits taken from photographs, there could exist amongst the Russian reading public a shared knowledge of what Russia's most celebrated writers looked like. However one writer's visual representation was established prior to the invention of photography and its reproduction and evolution throughout the second half of the nineteenth century was not due not to the fact that this particular representation was believed by all to be a good physical likeness, but to the particularly strong way it represented certain parts of A.S Pushkin's identity and provided those in the business of image reproduction, as well as the Russian public, with an iconography that could be immediately recognized as belonging to Pushkin.

Part Two

The Use and Abuse of A.S. Pushkin

Section i. The Visual Heritage of A.S. Pushkin

For Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin (1799-1837) personal appearance seemed to have been an issue that mattered, but also one he was liable to neglect. In his biography of the poet, T.J. Binyon considers Pushkin's own concern with the way he looked and others', often none too kind, comments on the subject. Pushkin's side-whiskers, height, build, personal hygiene, dress, skin, and fingernails were all remarked upon with distaste; in the words of one of his female contemporaries: 'God, having endowed him with unique Genius, did not grant him an attractive exterior.'⁵²⁹ It could therefore be seen as somewhat strange that by the end of nineteenth century visual representations of Pushkin were more prolific and accessible than those of any other Russian writer, or arguably any other famous Russian figure. This part of the thesis examines the ways in which Pushkin was visually represented in the second half of the nineteenth century and what particular aspects of his personal, professional and national identities were emphasised and developed. It hopes to demonstrate the extent to which a writer's visual representation could be used, and even abused, by different parties in late imperial Russia.

During Pushkin's life and after his death the volume and variety of representations depicting him steadily rose and can be divided into two basic types. Firstly, traditional portraits of the writer and secondly, 'pictures' which contain an image of Pushkin, but in which the main theme of the work is a scene from the writer's life, real or imagined. For example, a number of pictures were produced based on Pushkin's fatal duel with Baron Georges d'Anthès.⁵³⁰ Of course, some works transcend these boundaries and a 'picture' can contain a more effective representation of Pushkin than a traditional 'portrait'. However, what makes the visual representation of Pushkin in the second half of the nineteenth century so fascinating is the diversity of the locations where his

⁵²⁹ Anna Alekseevna Olenina (1808-1888) quoted in T.J. Binyon, *Pushkin: A Biography*, London, 2003, p. 277.

⁵³⁰ The most well known is A.A. Naumov, *The Duel between Pushkin and d'Anthès (Duel' Pushkina s Dantesom)*, (1884). There is also A.M. Volkov, *Duel*, (1869) and P.F. Borel', *The Return of Pushkin from the Duel (Vozvrashchenie Pushkina s dueli)*, (1885).

image appeared, and the particular representations of Pushkin they presented. The number of visual representations of Pushkin produced between his lifetime and 1899 is truly staggering and this thesis does not attempt to cover all of them.⁵³¹ Rather, it aims to give a broad overview of what images were the most prevalent and in particular, examine the ‘exhibition’ of Pushkin and the use of Pushkin’s image by manufacturers and in advertising.

Although a handful of portraits of the poet were reproduced in the years immediately following his death, for example Karl Peter Mazer’s portrait of Pushkin (1839),⁵³² E.V. Pavlova correctly observes that ‘the three decades after the death of Pushkin, the 1840s-60s were the most barren for the creation of the iconography of the poet.’⁵³³ A substantial surge in representations of Pushkin and their reproduction did not begin until the 1870s, when works such as N.N. Ge’s *Pushchin and Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* (1875) (Fig. 90) reintroduced Pushkin as a significant image in Russian visual culture. Pavlova identifies two particular areas of growth in Pushkin images in the 1870s. Firstly, the creation of monuments, and secondly, ‘the creation of historical genre pictures on themes connected with the life of the poet.’⁵³⁴ Of these, the aforementioned work by Ge was the most well known; this section pays particular attention to it and the reception it received from Russian critics and publishers.

However, it was in the 1880s and 1890s that visual representations of the poet dramatically rose in number, and it would be no exaggeration to state Pushkin had a visual culture all of his own in late imperial Russia. There were three key events that kept the writer in the public consciousness and partly

⁵³¹ In accordance with the rest of the study I will not be discussing sculptures, busts, or monuments to the poet, except the statue designed by A.M. Opekushin, as it was central to the 1880 Pushkin Celebration. Significant scholarly work has been undertaken on three-dimensional representations of Pushkin. For example, A. Samoilov, ‘Skul’pturnye portrety Pushkina’, *Iskusstvo*, no. 5, 1949, pp. 45-50; L.P. Fevchuk, ‘Pervye skul’pturnye izobrazheniia Pushkina’, in M.M. Kalaushin, *Pushkin i ego vremia: sbornik statei*, Leningrad, 1962, pp. 395-407. At present A.D. Gdalin is undertaking a complete history and inventory of all monuments erected to Pushkin. See A.D. Gdalin, *Pamiatniki Pushkin: Istoriia. Opisanie. Bibliografiia. Tom I. Rossiia. Chast’ I. Sankt-Peterburg, Leningradskaia oblast’*, St. Petersburg, 2001. This work contains a detailed bibliography of all articles and studies that relate to Pushkin monuments in St. Petersburg.

⁵³² See E.V. Pavlova, *Pushkin v portretakh*, Moscow, 1989, p. 144 for an excellent reproduction of this painting. Its present location is the All-Russian Pushkin Museum, St. Petersburg.

⁵³³ E.V. Pavlova, ‘Portrety Pushkina’, in L.I. Vuich (comp.), *Moskovskaia izobrazitel’naia pushkiniana*, Moscow, 1986, pp. 11-48, p. 14. Pavlova has produced some of the most comprehensive research on the representation of Pushkin in Fine Art and this thesis makes frequent reference to her work.

⁵³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

explain the continual creation and reproduction of Pushkin-based images by artists and publishers. In 1880 the long awaited and campaigned-for monument to the writer was unveiled on Tverskoi Boulevard, Moscow. The involvement of intellectuals and writers in organizing this event means it holds a unique place in the history of the development of Pushkin's reputation in Russia, but also means attention is often focused on the intellectual and literary arguments that the event sparked, rather than the more popular aspects, such as its coverage in illustrated journals. The 1880 Pushkin Celebration was visually recorded not only through depictions of the monument, but also through the reproduction of other portraits of the writer in journals and pamphlets issued to commemorate the event. It was also around this time that manufacturers realised the commercial benefits to be gained from associating their products with Pushkin and the writer's image began to appear on items such as chocolate bar wrappers.

In 1887 Pushkin's works went out of copyright and numerous publishing houses brought out editions of his poems as well as biographies and critical essays, many of which contained portrait frontispieces. The fiftieth anniversary of the writer's death was also commemorated in newspaper and journal articles, which of course, had to be accompanied by portraits. Finally in 1899 the whole of Russia was encouraged by the tsarist authorities to celebrate the centenary of the poet's birth; this event marked a pinnacle in the visual representation of a Russian writer. Images of Pushkin flooded Russia, from striking portraits created by the most fashionable society artists, to the outline of the poet's features impressed onto a bar of soap (Fig. 91).⁵³⁵

The various locations where Pushkin's image appeared is a fascinating subject in itself, but the existence of an item such as steel pen nib fashioned to resemble the head of Pushkin (Fig. 92)⁵³⁶ raises some fundamental questions concerning the position of Pushkin, and writers in general, in Russian society at the end of the nineteenth century. Although Pushkin was a popular writer and by 1899 regarded as Russia's 'national' writer, this cannot entirely explain the

⁵³⁵ From the collection of the All-Russian Pushkin Museum, St. Petersburg. (Hereafter referred to as ARPM).

⁵³⁶ Promotional placard produced by the 'Russian company for the production of steel pen nibs in Riga' for their 'A.S. Pushkin pen'. The placard shows the five pen nibs available (in different colours) along with a picture of the box that they can be purchased in. This has a portrait of Pushkin prominently on the front. Collection ARPM.

enthusiasm with which manufacturers used his image.⁵³⁷ In the section on Pushkin in 1899, we will analyse how Pushkin's national, professional and personal identities were communicated in representations of him, the depiction of the latter identity becoming far more significant than had previously been seen in any other writer. In relation to the commercial value of Pushkin we will discuss whether the appearance of the poet, as well as other writers, on disposable items indicates a trivialisation of attitudes towards them, or the reverse, is evidence of their exalted status and established place in Russian public consciousness.

The visual representation of Pushkin, in particular the portraits by Orest Adamovich Kiprenskii (1782-1836) (Fig. 93) and Vasilii Andreevich Tropinin (1776-1857) (Fig. 94) has attracted a considerable amount of scholarly attention. Articles, monographs, and catalogues appeared in Russia throughout the twentieth century containing images and analysis of portraits of Pushkin, his family, his friends and notable figures from the 'Pushkin era'.⁵³⁸ However, the study of the visual representation of Pushkin has its foundation not in the twentieth century but in the nineteenth. The 1890s not only witnessed the

⁵³⁷ The question of how popular Pushkin was in nineteenth-century Russia is addressed by P. Debreczeny, 'Puškin's Reputation in Nineteenth-Century Russia. A Statistical Approach', in D.M. Bethea (ed.), *Puškin Today*, Bloomington, 1993, pp. 201-213. In this article Debreczeny analyses references to Pushkin in a number of journals over the course of the nineteenth century and occurrences of the poet's name. It should be noted that in his opening lines Debreczeny states that it is difficult to measure the position of a writer in the public consciousness and to do so one can examine literary critics, scholars, contemporaries' diaries, letters, records of publishers, lending libraries and in Debreczeny's case, references to the writer outside the context of their work. However at no time does Debreczeny refer to the visual representation of writers. Even when referring to the Pushkin Jubilee of 1899 he makes no reference to the presence of the writer visually. However Debreczeny's conclusions support this thesis' own supposition, that Pushkin was the most prominent and well known writer in nineteenth-century Russia: 'he [Pushkin] had achieved already in his twenties the kind of recognition that was to be granted to Tolstoj only in his seventies and to Dostoevskii, Turgenev and Čexov only after their deaths. [...] by the turn of the century he had become the timeless national poet of Russia. The term "Russia's Shakespeare" is not an empty cliché: by the 100th anniversary of his birth Puškin had become an integral part of the "personality" of the educated Russian.' pp. 212-213.

⁵³⁸ Although western scholars have paid little attention to the visual representation of Pushkin, his depiction in paintings, engravings and sculpture has been subject to countless articles and studies by Soviet scholars throughout the twentieth century and works continue to be produced both academic and popular in nature. The bibliography supplied by Pavlova in *Pushkin v portretakh*, pp. 141-145 lists almost 100 studies on aspects of Pushkin's representation written between 1914-1986. The centenary of the poet's death in 1937 generated a number of articles by Soviet scholars such as E.F. Gollerbakh and I.S. Zil'bershtein and from then on the study of Pushkin's portrait was regularly revisited. Pushkin's life and works have remained a source of inspiration for Russian artists and illustrators in a manner incomparable with the treatment of any British writer. Some particularly striking images of the poet were created in the 1930s in the

diversification of Pushkin's portrait, it also marked the beginning of scholarly study of the topic. Although two small journalistic pieces appeared in 1837 and 1871 on portraits of Pushkin,⁵³⁹ the first serious discussion of the visual representation of the poet was published in 1890 by Sigismund Librovich. *Pushkin in Portraits (Pushkin v portretakh)*⁵⁴⁰ is a remarkable work that present scholars continue to turn to and it deserves particular mention not only as a source of information on rarely seen or unusual images of the poet, but because it reflects late nineteenth-century attitudes towards Pushkin and how he should, or should not be represented. *Pushkin v portretakh* covers all types of visual representations – paintings, engravings, sculptures, statues, medals and presents them in chronological order from the earliest portrait of Pushkin as a pupil at the Imperial Tsarskoe Selo Lycée⁵⁴¹ to his placement on packaging at the end of the 1880s. Not only did it comment on the portraits, it also reproduced a large number of them; the scale of its undertaking is reflected in a small piece of pre-publication publicity, a short paragraph in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*.

The book is a bulky volume, of large format, with seventy illustrations including reproductions of oil on canvas portraits of Pushkin, copies of engravings, drawings and other pictures in which Pushkin is depicted, facsimiles of portraits sketched by Pushkin himself, views of monuments to the poet, drawings of proposed monuments, images of Pushkin statuettes and others. Similar collections concerning portraits of Shakespeare, Goethe and Shiller already exist overseas and enjoy great success.⁵⁴²

Librovich was writing just prior to the explosion of Pushkin imagery on products, but as early as 1880 companies had started to use the writer's portrait as a means to attract purchasers. Librovich's attitude towards the appropriation of Pushkin's portrait is discussed further on, but what should be remarked upon

graphic arts. See A.M. Efros, 'Sovetskie khudozhniki na pushkinskom iubilee', *Sovetskoe iskusstvo*, 11 February 1937, p. 4 and 18 February 1937, p. 2.

⁵³⁹ N.V. Kukol'nik, 'Pis'mo v Parizh', *Khudozhestvennaia gazeta*, nos. 9-10, 1837, pp. 160-162. 'Zametka o portretakh A.S. Pushkina', *Russkii khudozhestvennyi listok*, no. 32, 1871, pp. 131-135.

⁵⁴⁰ S. Librovich, *Pushkin v portretakh. Istoriia izobrazheniia poeta v zhivopisi, graviure, skul'pture*, St. Petersburg, 1890. (Hereafter referred to as Librovich, *Pushkin*.)

⁵⁴¹ The Imperial Lycée was located in the grounds of the imperial palace and estate Tsarskoe selo, located just outside of St. Petersburg. Pushkin attended the Lycée from 1811-1817 and was one of the first students there. Binyon, *Pushkin*, pp. 14-41. Pushkin's time at the Lycée was most vividly brought to life by I.E. Repin in his colourful depiction of Pushkin the budding poet dazzling his examiners with a recital of verse. *Pushkin at the Lycée Public Examination (Pushkin na Litseiskom akte)* (1911).

⁵⁴² 'Khudozhestvennye novosti', *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 42, 15 October 1889, p. 255.

is the fact that Librovich was far-thinking enough to consider these type of images at all, to include them in a serious study alongside portraits by some of Russia's best known artists. Twentieth-century scholars have often dismissed Pushkin 'kitsch' as it is sometimes termed, and so it is to Librovich's credit that he did not immediately dismiss these sorts of representations or simply ignore them, but considered them seriously and what their existence revealed about attitudes towards Pushkin in the 1880s. Librovich recognized the wide reaching nature of his work and in the preface noted, with a mixture of both pride and modesty:

Thus, 'Pushkin in portraits' has a wider conception than those few similar foreign works, existing up until now, about the portraits of Shakespeare, Goethe, and Molière, as well as a work which is currently being printed about Pushkin's great friend Mickiewicz. Whether I had some success in fulfilling my idea – I cannot myself judge.⁵⁴³

In 1899 Librovich's book was particularly relevant and was promoted during the Pushkin Centenary year. Fig. 95 shows a newspaper advert from 1899, placed by the bookseller M.O. Vol'f, who obviously hoped to profit from the Pushkin Jubilee. The volume was priced at three roubles⁵⁴⁴ and the advertisement made the most of the fact that the work contained seventy illustrations; a small Pushkin portrait placed next to the text supporting the statement. At the very bottom of the advertisement are a few lines to reflect the serious nature of the book and its educational value; this was not *just* a collection of illustrations. The advertisement states that the book has the approval of the committee members of

⁵⁴³ Librovich, *Pushkin*, preface (no page no.). Although other scholars of portraits of Pushkin make reference to Librovich's book only one has attempted a serious assessment of it. M. Beliaev, 'Zametki na poliakh knigi S. Librovicha *Pushkin v portretakh*', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 16-18, 1934, pp. 968-979. Beliaev methodically addresses Librovich's treatment of portraits of Pushkin and although he highlights some inaccuracies in the work and argues Librovich did not cover the lithographic reproduction of Pushkin's portrait as fully as he might, he concludes the work has 'honestly conducted its fifty years service.' p. 979.

⁵⁴⁴ Collection ARPM. A project by the Moscow State University on wages and the price of bread in late imperial Russia offers a useful marker for understanding the price of items at this time. See the website http://www.hist.msu.ru/Labour/Database/bor_base.htm. For example in 1899 a pound of top quality bread cost 4 kopecks and the daily wage of a labourer was 80 kopecks. Librovich's book was therefore only affordable for those of comfortable financial means. Compare this to the album of Pushkin portraits advertised in *Niva*, no. 19, 1899 which advertised 'around one hundred drawings and portraits' for the price of fifty kopecks (or sixty including postage). This particular album was aimed at lower income social groups as it was produced by the Land and City Board for educational establishments, proprietors of factories and workshops.

the Ministry of People's Education and that this book is approved for educational libraries of middle schools.⁵⁴⁵

Before examining the representation of Pushkin in the second half of the nineteenth century, we must first turn briefly to those portraits of the writer created during his lifetime. These include the two most celebrated portraits of Pushkin by Kiprenskii and Tropinin. These portraits are a point of departure for any examination of the visual representation of Pushkin as it is from these two works, in particular the Kiprenskii portrait, the majority of subsequent images derived and evolved. Indeed, the Kiprenskii portrait, more than any other, defined the iconography of Pushkin for the remainder of the nineteenth century and was reproduced both in copies faithful to the original, as well as those that freely adapted and modified Kiprenskii's work.

In the opening chapter of *Pushkin v portretakh* Librovich considered the position of visual representations of Pushkin in the second half of the nineteenth century. Librovich opened with a quotation from I.S. Turgenev, made by the writer in relation to the design of the proposed Pushkin monument:

The distinctive feature of the poetry of Pushkin is elegant and intelligent simplicity, and it is namely this simplicity that must reveal itself in the image of the poet.⁵⁴⁶

Librovich takes this observation as his starting point and then goes on to make bold statements that his audience might have found uncomfortable reading:

Would all share this opinion? Undoubtedly, no. This can be already judged by the fact that the Russian public remains dissatisfied with almost all portraits of the poet made in his life-time and acknowledged by contemporaries as fair likenesses, finding, that in these portraits Pushkin does 'not at all resemble a great poet' and they search out other portraits-namely those in which in the poet's eye is reflected that internal flame, that genius, which created a whole series of brilliant, inspirational, poetic works, such as *Poltava*, *Onegin*, *Ruslan and Liudmilla* and many others. In a portrait of Pushkin many would want to meet now the proud, beautiful face of Byron, that pensive head of Mickiewicz now full of deep thoughts, now the philosophically-calm, but expressive features of Goethe. Some artists of late have tried as far as possible to satisfy this wish of the public (of course, only part of the public), to reproduce a portrait of Pushkin of a new kind: with a thoughtful appearance, a proud look, into the far distance, and so on. In spite of the fact, that such

⁵⁴⁵ Collection ARPM.

⁵⁴⁶ Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 1.

artificial appropriation to the poet's appearance, that such an assumed effect has no correspondence to reality, nevertheless it is impossible to say, that such portraits do not bear at least some similarity to the originals taken from life and recognised as the true image of the poet [...]

Be that as it may, it is a fact, undoubtedly, that the newest, to a certain extent counterfeit portraits of Pushkin, with the assumed effect of 'the imprint of poetry and genius in his facial features', enjoy amongst the populace the greatest success-and more and more one meets such portraits in frames and albums of the poet's admirers and in many popular publications of his works. Of course, experts and people who understand that the merit of a portrait does not lie in a false effect, and that Pushkin's genius must be sought in his works, and not in his portraits-these people prefer superficially 'bad' but true likenesses to all these latest fabrications for effect.⁵⁴⁷

This long passage merits repetition as it raises the issue of the relationship of past representations of Pushkin to those of the 1880s. Librovič addresses one of the central concerns of this thesis: how is a 'writer' supposed to look and how is this to be expressed in his portrait? Librovič was of the opinion that first and foremost a portrait should be a 'true' physical likeness and chastises those who wish to see the 'imprint of poetry and genius' upon Pushkin's face and retorts 'Pushkin did not have a beautiful face'.⁵⁴⁸ Librovič, however, could be seen to misconstrue the situation and this thesis will argue that far from being 'dissatisfied' with portraits of Pushkin made during his lifetime, artists and designers turned to these images as the basis for subsequent representations. Librovič does acknowledge this, although somewhat reluctantly: 'it is impossible to say, that such portraits do not bear at least some similarity to the originals taken from life and recognised as the true image of the poet.' We will concede that portraits produced in the 1870s onwards were often adapted, some might say mutilated, compared to the originals, but their visual heritage is quite apparent. Moreover, one look through V.Ia Adariukov's inventory of engraved and lithographed portraits of Pushkin⁵⁴⁹ shows us that portraits of the poet executed between 1822 and 1837 were continually reproduced throughout the

⁵⁴⁷ Librovič, *Pushkin*, pp. 1-3.

⁵⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 3.

⁵⁴⁹ V.Ia. Adariukov, *Ukazatel' gravirovannykh i litografirovannykh portretov A.S. Pushkina*, Moscow, 1926.

nineteenth century. The standard of the reproductions may be questionable at times, but the objective was to make available an 'original' portrait of Pushkin. In the above quotation Libroich does not directly mention which portraits are the 'fair likenesses' and which are the 'latest fabrications' but in the vast range of Pushkin representations there are five portraits made during the writer's lifetime that are of the greatest significance in reference to the formation of a Pushkin iconography and the subsequent creation of images. These are Georg Johann Geitman's copperplate engraving (1822) (Fig. 96); Tropinin's and Kiprenskii's oil on canvas portraits (both 1827); Nikolai Ivanovich Utkin's copperplate engraving of the Kiprenskii portrait (1827) (Fig. 97); and finally a steel plate engraving by the British artist Thomas Wright (1837) (Fig. 98).⁵⁵⁰ There were other portraits made of Pushkin during his lifetime and these will be referred to when necessary, but it was the abovementioned five portraits that had the greatest influence on how Pushkin was perceived and represented for the remainder of the nineteenth century.

The Geitman Engraving

Although Kiprenskii's portrait of Pushkin may have become the most well known portrait of the writer, it was not the first, and certainly not the first that could be classified as being publicly accessible – i.e. on show in an exhibition or reproduced in print. This privilege is held by an engraving made by Georg Johann Geitman⁵⁵¹ which appeared as a frontispiece to the first edition of *Prisoner of the Caucasus (Kavkazskii plennik)* published in 1822 by N.I. Gnedich.⁵⁵² Pushkin was twenty-three years of age when *Kavkazskii plennik* was first issued, but the portrait by Geitman depicts a teenage boy, the age usually

⁵⁵⁰ G.J. Geitman *Pushkin*, 1822, copperplate engraving, 22.7 x 13.5cm. State Museum of A.S. Pushkin, Moscow. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of Aleksandr Pushkin*, 1827, oil on canvas, 68.5 x 55 cm. ARPM. O.A. Kiprenskii, *Portrait of Aleksandr Pushkin*, 1827, oil on canvas, 63x54 cm, TG. N.I. Utkin, *Portrait of Aleksandr Pushkin*, copperplate engraving, frontispiece to *Severnye tsvety* 1828, 13x10 cm, State Museum of A.S. Pushkin, Moscow. T. Wright, *Pushkin*, 1837, steel plate engraving, 16.5 x 12.4 cm, State Museum of A.S. Pushkin, Moscow.

⁵⁵¹ Rovinskii lists Geitman in *Podrobnyi slovar russkikh graverov XVI-XIX vv*, p. 227 and gives his dates as 1798-1862. However, Pavlova and others, list them as 1800-1829. Rovinskii also states that Geitman was a pupil of Thomas Wright, creator of another outstanding engraved portrait of Pushkin. Geitman's engraving is discussed in all studies of portraits of Pushkin. Libroich begins his history of portraits with it and it is the first entry in Adariukov's inventory. The engraving is discussed at some length by B. Borskii in 'Ikongrafiia Pushkina do portretov Kiprenskogo i Tropinina', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 16-18, Moscow, 1934, pp. 961-968.

⁵⁵² The book was issued on 14 August 1822. It cost either five roubles or seven (if on vellum) and its initial print run of around 1,200 copies quickly sold out. Binyon, *Pushkin*, p. 151.

ascribed is twelve or fourteen years of age. Gnedich included the following note about the portrait in the volume of poetry. ‘The editors have added a portrait of the author, drawn from him in youth. They believe it is pleasing to preserve the youthful features of a poet whose first works are marked by so unusual a talent.’⁵⁵³ In writing these words, Gnedich would not have been aware that he raises a subject that became fundamental to the subsequent depiction of Pushkin: youth. The exact age that Pushkin is meant to be in the portrait and whether it was an accurate representation of him as a youth is a topic that has been fiercely debated. Nevertheless, whether Pushkin is meant to be twelve⁵⁵⁴ or a little older at fifteen, the age given by Binyon; or older still aged around seventeen;⁵⁵⁵ he is still a youth, a young man. Kiprenskii’s and Tropinin’s portraits depict the poet aged twenty-eight, still relatively young, particularly when we consider the age of most of the writers when painted by the *Peredvizhniki*: Ostrovskii, Dostoevskii, Turgenev, Tolstoi, were all over thirty-five years of age. Due to his untimely death, Pushkin remained in the public consciousness as a young man, a fundamental element it often seems to the establishment of celebrity status. Although perhaps the most obvious examples may come from the twentieth century, for example John F. Kennedy or James Dean, the precedent was set in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by writers. Pushkin, Keats, Byron, Shelly – none of these authors reached their fortieth year and they remained eternally young in their portraits. But none more so than Pushkin in Geitman’s portrait. This portrait does not represent the poet as a fully-fledged writer, but it does allude to some of the key elements in the construction of the Pushkin iconography.

Geitman’s portrait is a simple composition; there are no accessories or background and it focuses entirely on the poet’s face. On receipt of a copy of the portrait Pushkin wrote to Gnedich ‘Aleksandr Pushkin is lithographed in masterly fashion, but I do not know whether it is like him, the editor’s note [given above] is very flattering, but I do not know whether it is just.’⁵⁵⁶ This

⁵⁵³ The original Russian is repeated in a number of places, including Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 6. This translation is taken from Binyon, *Pushkin*, p. 151.

⁵⁵⁴ 12-14 is the age most scholars give to Pushkin in this portrait and it is the one Librovich uses. *Pushkin*, p. 4.

⁵⁵⁵ See B. Borskii, ‘Iconografiia Pushkina’ for an overview of a debate on the topic up to 1934.

⁵⁵⁶ Pushkin-Gnedich, 27 September 1822, quoted in Binyon, *Pushkin*, p. 151.

quotation raises the question of who made the original drawing or painting from which Geitman made his engraving - on what source was it based? A number of possible artists have been suggested by scholars, including Kiprenskii and Karl Briullov.⁵⁵⁷ A similar, although rather naïve, pastel and watercolour portrait was made around 1815, purportedly by Sergei Gavriilovich Chirikov. Chirikov was one of Pushkin's tutors at the Lycée and the painting presents Pushkin in a similar pose, with his face resting on his right hand. Indeed, the way in which Pushkin is presented in Chirikov's and Geitman's portraits is far more significant than if Briullov drew a portrait from which Geitman did make an engraving. As far as our line of enquiry is concerned the details concerning the creation of the portrait are not as significant as how Pushkin is presented and how the portrait was received.

The majority of scholars who have analysed the Geitman portrait draw comparisons between it and one of Byron painted by Richard Westall in 1813. Librovich states: 'The boy Pushkin is presented in profile, in a open neck shirt à la Byron, with dark curly hair'.⁵⁵⁸ Westall's portrait of Byron was well known in the 1810s and 1820s. Piper comments that it 'proved, via engravings and copies, perhaps even more influential than Phillip's'.⁵⁵⁹ Pavlova also comments on the availability of the Byron portrait.⁵⁶⁰ Westall presents Byron in a similar pose to Pushkin and they do wear similar shirts, but Byron's profile is at a more acute angle and it is obviously a portrait of a man, rather than a boy. Pushkin was a great admirer of Byron's poetry, which was available in Russia in French translations from as early as 1815,⁵⁶¹ although Pushkin only developed a passion for it after leaving the Lycée.⁵⁶² An engraving of the Westall portrait of Byron could have been available to Geitman, but if he did use it as a direct model it would have been without Pushkin's knowledge, who as his comment to Gnedich

⁵⁵⁷ L. Pevzner investigates on what source Geitman based his engraving upon. 'Kto zh avtor originala?', *Khudozhnik*, no. 12, 1968, pp. 33-36. Pevzner puts forth a detailed and rather complex possible history for the origins of the portrait and concludes that it was possible that Briullov did make the original portrait drawing.

⁵⁵⁸ Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 4.

⁵⁵⁹ D. Piper, *British Poets*, p. 133. 'Phillip's' refers to the portrait of Byron by Thomas Phillips (1813-14).

⁵⁶⁰ Pavlova, *Pushkin v portretakh*, p. 15.

⁵⁶¹ E. Feinstein, *Pushkin*, London, 1998, p. 56.

⁵⁶² Both Binyon and Feinstein note that Pushkin developed a love of Byron's works whilst staying with the Raevskii family in the Crimean town of Gurzuf during the first part of his exile in 1820.

indicates, was somewhat undecided in his opinion of his depiction. Pavlova, in her discussion of the Geitman portrait, puts forth one theory belonging to the Pushkinist and collector of Pushkin portraits Ia.G. Zak⁵⁶³ that the portrait was a combination of Westall's Byron and Pushkin's brother Lev, who was similar in appearance to Pushkin.⁵⁶⁴ Geitman of course had no access to Pushkin 'in the flesh' in 1822 as the poet had been exiled from the capital two years earlier. Pavlova herself argues that Geitman's portrait was neither 'in accordance with Pushkin's appearance at that time, nor a representation of the ideal personality (*lichnosti*) of the romantic poet' but nevertheless has entered history and is 'firmly engrained in the memory of countless generations.'⁵⁶⁵ Whether it was an accurate portrayal of Pushkin during his time at the Lycée is somewhat irrelevant as during the course of the nineteenth century it came to be perceived as *the* representation of Pushkin at that time in his life. It does not present him as a Romantic poet - he is too young - neither can comparisons be drawn between it and the main figure in the book it accompanied; this youth is also far too young to be adventuring through the mountains and falling in love with Circassian girls. In some respects the success of the portrait is surprising considering what it does *not* represent or allude to. However, what it does do is provide a clear engraved portrait that is easy to reproduce. It also provides the foundation for the iconography of Pushkin – those elements of his image that became the means by which a viewer immediately knew that the portrait they were looking at, be it in a gallery or on a bar of soap, was Pushkin.

Pushkin was too young in Geitman's portrait to have side-whiskers, but the mass of dark curly hair that is present in all later images of the poet is depicted. Pushkin's hair is one of the main elements in his iconography and as we will see, some later portraits over-exaggerated it. What Geitman's engraving does demonstrate is that the life of a portrait sometimes only begins long after the subject's death. Indeed, according to Adariukov and Librovich, the Geitman portrait disappeared for a time from public consciousness after 1822. It was reproduced in *Khudozhestvennaia gazeta* in 1837 with the note, 'not as a

⁵⁶³ Iakov Grigor'evich Zak (1905-1971).

⁵⁶⁴ Lev Sergeevich Pushkin (1805-1852). Pavlova, *Pushkin v portretakh*, p. 17.

⁵⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

contemporary portrait, but as a memory’⁵⁶⁶ and did not appear again in a published source until 1861 when V. Timm produced a lithograph of it for *Russkii khudozhestvennyi listok*.⁵⁶⁷ Yet it was not until the 1870s and the beginning of a revived interest in Pushkin in general, that it started to be widely reproduced, a process that continued through the 1880s and 1890s and which saw the Geitman portrait establish itself in the ‘canon’ of popular representations of Pushkin. This assumption can be concluded from Librovič’s comments on the work, but also from more tangible evidence - it graced the lid of a box of chocolates, for example (Fig. 99).⁵⁶⁸

The Kiprenskii and Tropinin Portraits

In 1822 a visual representation of Pushkin entered the public sphere that depicted the poet as a young, rather charming, innocent looking youth. Five years later two portraits were executed from life, both of which presented the poet as a twenty-seven or twenty-eight year old man, but which also provided two very different representations of the poet. The two paintings derived from similar commissions - both were ordered by long-standing friends of the poet. Baron Anton Antonovich Del’vig (1798-1831), a fellow Lycée pupil, ordered the portrait made by O.A. Kiprenskii and Sergei Aleksandrovich Sobolevskii (1803-1870) the one made by V.A. Tropinin. The Tropinin portrait was painted first, in Moscow, in the early months of 1827 and the Kiprenskii portrait in St.

⁵⁶⁶ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 8.

⁵⁶⁷ Adariukov, *Ukazatel’*, entry no. 308, p. 24.

⁵⁶⁸ Collection ARPM. This was not the only engraving Geitman made of Pushkin. In 1828 he produced an imaginative scene that showed Pushkin together with his most famous creation Evgenii Onegin, by the banks of the Neva, the Peter and Paul Fortress in the background. Both men are fashionably dressed, Onegin the more outlandish with a stripy lining to his cloak. The engraving was taken from a drawing made by Aleksandr Vasil’evich Notbek (1802-1866) and appeared in the *Nevskii al’manakh*, 1829 accompanied by two lines from *Onegin*. This picture was regarded by Rovinskii as a ‘very poor work’ although Librovič thought this comment unjust and supposed Rovinskii must have an inferior copy of it. Librovič, *Pushkin*, pp. 35-36. Adariukov, however, takes Rovinskii’s attitude towards the work and claims Pushkin was also dissatisfied with it. Adariukov, *Ukazatel’*, p. 10. The reason behind the poet’s displeasure with the picture is that he had initially provided Notbek with a sketch (Pushkin was quite the amateur artist, or rather caricaturist) of himself and Onegin. Some years earlier in a letter to his brother Lev Sergeevich written at the beginning of November 1824, Pushkin had included a drawing of himself and Onegin standing on the Neva embankment with the Peter and Paul Fortress in the background. See R.G. Zhuikova, *Portretnye risunki Pushkina. Katalog atributsii*, St. Petersburg, 1996, p. 48. But Pushkin’s drawing was quite different to the picture finally produced by Notbek. Both the Pushkin sketch and the Notbek/Geitman picture are reproduced in Pavlova, *Pushkin v portretakh*, p. 24 and p. 105 respectively. In the nineteenth century, Librovič reproduced the engraving in his book, p. 36 but that was one of the few places the picture could be found.

Petersburg, between May and June of the same year.⁵⁶⁹ Both portraits show Pushkin from the waist up with his head turned at an angle to his left, and they both depict the basic physiognomy of Pushkin, but there the similarities end. In Tropinin's portrait Pushkin is shown wearing relaxed, rather shabby clothing, whereas in Kiprenskii's portrait he is in a fashionable suit, bow tie, and with a length of tartan draped over his right shoulder. Pushkin's long fingernails, so often remarked upon by his acquaintances, are masterfully depicted by Kiprenskii. However in Tropinin's work, Pushkin's hand is closed and only a thumbnail is visible, instead, attention is drawn to his famous 'talisman' ring which is on display. Pavlova describes Tropinin's Pushkin as 'the national hero of the people', whereas Kiprenskii's Pushkin is the 'genius of poetry'.⁵⁷⁰ Although these could be seen as somewhat simplistic characterizations, they neatly reflect the fundamental differences between the two works and the contrasting ways in which Tropinin and Kiprenskii reflected Pushkin's identities.

With regards to the concerns of this thesis, the Kiprenskii portrait is by far the more significant. Librovič called it 'the most popular of all representations of Pushkin',⁵⁷¹ and as we will see, this was not a random statement but one based on the evidence that surrounded Librovič - numerous reproductions and adaptations of this portrait. According to Adariukov's inventory, eighteen published engraved or lithographed portraits were produced based upon Tropinin's portrait, whereas one hundred and ten were produced based upon Kiprenskii's.⁵⁷² Moreover, Kiprenskii's portrait established itself as the main source for a definite Pushkin iconography and represented the poet in such a recognizable way, that it became the visual point of reference to which subsequent portraits nearly always turned.

Tropinin's Pushkin

According to a note in the catalogue of the 1899 Pushkin exhibition held in the Imperial Academy of Sciences, the original painting by Tropinin 'until recently

⁵⁶⁹ Pavlova, *Pushkin v portretakh*, p. 38.

⁵⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 42.

⁵⁷¹ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 25.

⁵⁷² This does not take into account the images that appeared on packaging and advertising that I will later focus on.

has been at an unknown location'.⁵⁷³ The catalogue then recounts a version of a legendary story that is connected to the portrait, another variation is given by Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich in his compendium of famous portraits⁵⁷⁴ and the story was also published earlier, in the album of the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition.⁵⁷⁵ The basic outline of the story is not to do with the portrait's creation, but what happened once it was completed. Apparently, when Tropinin finished the portrait, Sobolevskii was abroad and so the artist entrusted the portrait to a third party, another artist called Smirnov. Smirnov then decided to play a practical joke on Sobolevskii and made a fair copy of the Tropinin portrait that he would give to Sobolevskii whilst keeping the original. Some years later Smirnov suddenly died and the genuine picture was put up for sale with the rest of his possessions, believed to be a copy not the original. It was only when Tropinin saw his portrait in a shop that the incident fully came to light and Tropinin confirmed the portrait's provenance to its new owner Prince M.A. Obolenskii (1805-1873). There are variations of this tale but its existence demonstrates that any aspect of Pushkin's life was subject to myth making. Although the painting may have been shrouded in mystery, the Pushkin it represents is rather plain and sombre. This reflects the nature of the commission; Sobolevskii did not want an image of a great poet, he wanted 'an image of the poet as he is to me, at home in his *khalat* (dressing gown) dishevelled, with his cherished talisman ring on the thumb of one hand.'⁵⁷⁶ Tropinin was true to his patron's request and appears to have fulfilled his remit. He presents Pushkin in his *khalat*, worn over a Byronic open neck shirt with a somewhat tatty scarf wrapped around him. As was discussed in the introduction, the depiction of writers and intellectuals in such a state of dress was not unusual in eighteenth and nineteenth-century portraiture. Tropinin also makes a visual reference to

⁵⁷³ *Pushkinskaia iubileinaia vystavka v Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk. Katalog*, St. Petersburg, 1899, no. 215, p. 26.

⁵⁷⁴ Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, *Russkie portrety XVIII i XIX vekov*, St. Petersburg, 1905-1909, p. 189.

⁵⁷⁵ L. Polivanov (ed.), *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887, pp. 98-100. According to the Album the story was originally printed in an article by N.V. Berg, 'Iz rasskazov S.A. Sobolevskogo', *Russkii arkhiv*, 1871, no 1.

⁵⁷⁶ These lines by Sobolevskii are frequently quoted in studies on portraits of Pushkin. But according to *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda* they first appeared in the aforementioned Berg article in *Russkii arkhiv*.

Pushkin's professional identity through the pile of papers under the poet's right hand, a far less dramatic accessory than Kiprenskii's use of a statuette of a muse, and evidence of the reality of writing. The white shirt collar provides a frame to Pushkin's face; the majority of the picture is executed in shades of brown, so the bright white brings out the fleshy tones in Pushkin's skin. Other portraits had been executed between the Geitman engraving and Tropinin's portrait,⁵⁷⁷ however these two works similarly depict the poet in terms of dress and the physiognomy of Pushkin. The poet has the same mass of curls, although they are rather tidier in Tropinin's portrait and similarly Tropinin highlights the poet's large round eyes and wide lips. The one major addition to the portrait is Pushkin's sidewhiskers, a fundamental element of the Pushkin iconography. Therefore Tropinin's portrait does not present us with an entirely 'new' Pushkin, there are references to the Geitman portrait and the poet's physical features are clearly depicted; N.A. Polevoi's review of it in the *Moskovskii telegraf* remarked that 'the likeness is staggering' and also made comparisons to portraits of Byron.⁵⁷⁸ Yet Tropinin's Pushkin failed to become *the* representation of the poet and to have a strong visual resonance in late imperial Russia. One must not think that the Tropinin portrait disappeared entirely from public view in the second half of the nineteenth century. The portrait and copies of it were included in the various Pushkin exhibitions that were staged in 1880 and 1899, it appeared in commemorative pamphlets and some companies did use it on their products' packaging. But the Pushkin Tropinin presented was not the Pushkin the public responded to, perhaps this was the portrait Librovich had in mind when he talked of the public's dissatisfaction with Pushkin portraits made from life, that in Tropinin's work, Pushkin failed to resemble the public's idea of what a 'great poet' looked like?

The personal nature of this portrait perhaps explains its failure to become *the* image of Pushkin. Unlike the Kiprenskii portrait, which portrays the poet in accordance with the traditions of Romantic portraiture, Tropinin's portrait is an

⁵⁷⁷ These include three by Joseph Vivien de Chateaubriand (1793-1852) in 1826 that were not that well known in the second half of the nineteenth century, though occasionally reproduced. Fig. 100 shows an engraving of one by Pannemaker on the front cover of *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* no. 46, 12 November 1883, which the journal was fairly enthusiastic about. Indeed, after discovering the portrait at the 1880 Moscow Pushkin exhibition the author of the article was most disappointed that the portrait was not reproduced in the exhibition album.

⁵⁷⁸ N.A. Polevoi, *Moskovskii telegraf*, no. 9, 1827, quoted in *Pushkin v Portretakh*, p. 40.

understated work. Pushkin is seated in a 'posed' position, but his dress is relaxed; a scarf loosely knotted around an open neck shirt. Although the painting was well received by Pushkin's contemporaries - certainly, Tropinin's depiction is more in keeping with some contemporaries' accounts of the poet's appearance and personal grooming, in addition, it also depicted a physical weakness in Pushkin, his astigmatism, which Catriona Kelly argues 'implies internal conflict.'⁵⁷⁹

Some present-day scholars, including Catriona Kelly and Orlando Figes seem to favour Tropinin's portrait over Kiprenskii's. Figes sees in it 'a gentleman who was perfectly at ease with the customs of his land.'⁵⁸⁰ Given that Tropinin could be seen to express Pushkin's national identity through depicting him in a *khalat*, unlike Kiprenskii who presents Pushkin in a fashionable European suit, one might have thought that this representation would have been particularly popular in 1899 with the tsarist authorities, who wanted to utilise the Pushkin Jubilee in order to encourage patriotic feeling. As Marcus Levitt points out, by involving themselves in the 1899 Jubilee the authorities aimed to take control of Russia's most revered writer: 'to make Russian literature a part of official culture'.⁵⁸¹ Surely then, Tropinin's portrait would have been the more obvious choice; there is nothing visually identifiably Russian about Kiprenskii's Pushkin. But there is more to Tropinin's work than a glib show of 'Russianness' and this is perhaps why it was never taken up by either state or commerce as *the* image of the poet. In the 1880s and 1890s events from Pushkin's personal life became increasingly better known through the publication of biographies and studies of the poet and this was also reflected in visual representations. Events from his life and his literary works blurred, and it often seemed that Pushkin was presented as much as character from one of his poems as their creator. In 1899 Pushkin was often presented as a representative of both Russian national achievement and also of romance and adventure. However, Tropinin does not present us with a heroic or idealised figure of Pushkin; in depicting Pushkin in his *khalat*, he tries to present something of the

⁵⁷⁹ C. Kelly, *Russian Literature. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford, 2001, p. 3

⁵⁸⁰ Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, p. 109.

⁵⁸¹ M. Levitt, 'Pushkin in 1899', in B. Gasparov et al. (eds.), *Cultural Mythologies of Russian Modernism. From the Golden Age to the Silver Age*, Berkeley, 1992, pp. 183-203, p. 187.

‘everyday’ Pushkin - ‘an image of the poet as he is to me’ - a representation of a friend, not a genius, staying at Sobolevskii’s Moscow apartment, living, according to Binyon, ‘in some squalor...[leading]... a dissipated existence.’⁵⁸² This perhaps is the problem with Tropinin’s work: it is too personal a portrait to gain universal appeal or admiration.

The other major factor to be considered when analysing why the Kiprenskii Pushkin became *the* Pushkin, is the public accessibility of the portraits. Tropinin’s portrait was not exhibited at the Imperial Academy of Arts in 1827, unlike Kiprenskii’s portrait, and although it was reviewed by critics, it was not immediately reproduced as an engraving, as Kiprenskii’s was. Although painted copies of the Tropinin portrait were produced,⁵⁸³ it seems to have remained a work that attracted little interest until the 1860s. In this decade two photographs were taken of it and reproductions made from them; these could be purchased at three roubles for a large print and one rouble for a small.⁵⁸⁴ It was not until the 1880s and 1890s that we see any number of reproductions of Tropinin’s Pushkin. It featured prominently on the front cover and on the inside of *Torzhestvo otkrytiia pamiatnika A.S. Pushkinu* as a wood engraving (Figs. 101 & 102) and in a number of newspapers and journals around this time as well. Fig. 103 shows it on the front cover of *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* in 1887 in an engraving made by L.A. Seriakov. It also appeared in the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition and in the 1899 Academy of Sciences Exhibition and was reproduced in both their albums. (Figs. 104 & 105) A good quality reproduction was produced on a box of chocolates and on individual chocolate wrappers manufactured by the firm A.I. Abrikosov and Sons (Figs. 106 & 107).⁵⁸⁵ Abrikosov and Sons was a Moscow-based firm and their choice of the Tropinin portrait may have had something to do with the company’s location. On the lid of the box was also reproduced a drawing of a house lived in by Pushkin in Moscow, and the company clearly states underneath ‘The Firm Abrikosov and

⁵⁸² Binyon, *Pushkin*, p. 255.

⁵⁸³ According to Librovich a copy was made by Tropinin which in 1889 was in the Tret’iakov Gallery and another copy was in existence that was included in the 1880 Moscow Pushkin exhibition. Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 24.

⁵⁸⁴ Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 24. According to Adariukov the first occasion the work was engraved was in 1872 by L. A. Seriakov for N.P. Polevoi’s *Istoriia russkoi slovesnosti*, St. Petersburg, 1872. Adariukov, *Ukazatel’*, no. 114, p. 14.

⁵⁸⁵ Collection ARPM.

Sons in Moscow'. Pushkin's appearance in traditional Russian dress in the Tropinin portrait was perhaps seen by the Abrikosov and Sons' packaging designers as the more fitting image to be associated with Moscow, the traditional Russian capital. The association of Pushkin with 'old' Russia and 'Russianness' is a subject that will be further discussed, as it did not usually occur in the manner of the Abrikosov box, but rather through the combination of a portrait of Pushkin surrounded by clearly identifiable 'Russian' accessories or visual references, such as mythical Russian warrior figures (*bogatyrs*). This is evident in perhaps the most colourful reproduction of the Tropinin portrait I encountered, on a calendar board surrounded by Russian maidens and *bogatyrs* (Fig. 108).⁵⁸⁶ In general however, the Tropinin Pushkin was not the representation of the poet that the nineteenth-century Russian public was continually exposed to, either in journals or in advertisements.

Kiprenskii's Pushkin and Utkin's engraving

In analysing Tropinin's portrait of Pushkin, continual reference has been made to Kiprenskii's portrait. This is unavoidable such is the dominance of Kiprenskii's representation of Pushkin in the second half of the nineteenth century and its contribution to the formation of a Pushkin iconography. Unlike Tropinin's work no legends surrounded this portrait, indeed, the album of the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition remarked: 'about the portrait by Kiprenskii little is known.'⁵⁸⁷ The only reference Pushkin made to the portrait in his letters is when he expressed the wish to purchase it for himself from Delvig's widow, which he did in the early months of 1831 for four thousand roubles.⁵⁸⁸ It remained in Pushkin's family until 1916 in which year it was acquired by the Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow, where it remains to this day.⁵⁸⁹ This indicates Pushkin's approval of the portrait, but a more direct compliment was the short verse he composed *Kiprenskumu (To Kiprenskii)* which contained the lines, 'I

⁵⁸⁶ Chocolate box and chocolate wrapper produced by the Firm Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899. Calendar published by lithographic workshop M.T. Solov'ev, Moscow, circa 1899. All collection ARPM.

⁵⁸⁷ *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, p. 99.

⁵⁸⁸ Pushkin refers to this purchase in his letter to P.A. Pletenev, 31 January 1831. See J. Thomas Shaw (trans.), *The Complete Works of Alexander Pushkin. Volume II. Letters 1826-1833*, Downham Market, Norfolk, 2002, pp. 456-457.

⁵⁸⁹ Allenova, *Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia galereia. Putevoditel'*, p. 60.

see myself as if in a mirror' and 'So to Rome, Dresden, Paris, in the future my appearance will be known.'⁵⁹⁰

Orlando Figes sums up Pushkin's appearance in the Kiprenskii work as 'polished nails and a cultivated air of boredom'.⁵⁹¹ This underestimates a portrait that has determined the visual representation of the poet more than any other. In the portrait Kiprenskii presents us with an urbane and urban Pushkin, smartly dressed, but with his mass of hair and prominent sidewhiskers detracting from the conventionality of his appearance. The poet avoids the viewer's gaze and stares off to his left. His crossed arms add to the confrontational air of the picture, rather than look 'bored' Pushkin seems defiant; he had only returned to Russian 'society' the year before after his period of exile.

Kiprenskii had previously painted the writer Zhukovskii (Fig. 5) in accordance with the Romantic tradition and continues that manner of depiction in the portrait of Pushkin. In Zhukovskii's case, the portrait's background of ruins and a windswept landscape made reference to Zhukovskii's poems and translations. With Pushkin, Kiprenskii indicates his subject's professional identity by a statuette of a muse behind Pushkin's left shoulder. This accessory takes up a considerable amount of the picture, unlike Tropinin's sheaf of papers in the corner, and its dark shape has a rather ambiguous presence in the portrait. Pushkin is facing away from it and the muse has her back to Pushkin; Kiprenskii could be making a reference to the struggle and difficulties involved in the creative process. However, the significance of this accessory should not be overestimated as reproductions of the portrait beginning with the first, Utkin's engraving, removed the muse figure. Later reproductions also had no need to include it – why go to the trouble of engraving a symbol of Pushkin's profession, when we know it is Pushkin by other elements of the iconography?

The most notable difference between Kiprenskii's Pushkin and Tropinin's is in the writer's dress. In Kiprenskii's portrait he is presented in a black suit with a bow tie, which would become an important element of the Pushkin iconography. Pushkin's appearance is very much that of a fashionable young man, a dandy of 1820s St. Petersburg. The poet would appear even

⁵⁹⁰ 'Kiprenskomu', A.S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, stikhotvoreniia 1826-1836*, Skazki, vol. III, book I, Moscow, 1995, p. 63.

⁵⁹¹ Figes, *Natasha's Dance*, p. 44.

smarter and more dashing in Thomas Wright's later engraved portrait. The difference in dress between Tropinin's Pushkin and Kiprenskii's is one of the most crucial reasons why I believe the latter Pushkin was taken up by firms and companies. Companies in the business of selling a luxury product (i.e chocolates or perfume) had to make the consumer desire their product; therefore they needed a Pushkin that was desirable. It was not enough for Pushkin to represent national literary achievement; he also had to be represented as an individual whom people would want to be associated with, or even aspire to be like. Living 'in some squalor', wrapped in a dressing gown, is not how Pushkin's personal existence is represented in 1899, either in Fine Art or in kitsch. Pushkin is always presented as well groomed and is sometimes associated with his most urbane creation, Evgenii Onegin. Pushkin is presented not only as the creator of Onegin, but also as his equal: a fellow dandy.⁵⁹² For it is as a finely attired, gentleman, rather than as an impoverished poet that Pushkin will be of most use to firms such as Ed. Pinaud, producers of 'Bouquet A.S. Pouchkine' (Fig. 109)⁵⁹³ or V.I. Meluzov of no. 19 Nevskii Prospect, retailer of the 'Pouchkine' shirt cuff for gentlemen.⁵⁹⁴ The 1899 Pushkin Jubilee coincided with a revival of Dandyism in Russia and the spread of the aesthetic movement throughout Europe, epitomised in Russia by the art group *World of Art* (*Mir Iskusstva*). Although some figures associated with *Mir Iskusstva* were the most outspoken critics of the Pushkin Jubilee, both contained manifestations of 'the culture of the dandy [which] spread further and as a result, became differentiated into mass and elite types.'⁵⁹⁵

In Kiprenskii's portrait, we are presented with Pushkin the Dandy, described by Leonid Grossman as possessing in 'his figure and manner [...] something extraordinarily original'.⁵⁹⁶ However this example of the European dandysim so favoured among young Russian men in the 1820s⁵⁹⁷ is in many ways far less pictorially innovative than Tropinin's work. Kiprenskii's portrait

⁵⁹² See footnote 586 on the sketch of Pushkin with Onegin on the banks of the Neva.

⁵⁹³ Ed. Pinaud, 'Bouquet Pouchkine' perfume, 1899, collection ARPM.

⁵⁹⁴ Collection ARPM.

⁵⁹⁵ O. Vainshtein, 'Russian Dandyism: Constructing a Man of Fashion', in B. Evans Clements, R. Friedman & D. Healey (eds.), *Russian Masculinities in History and Culture*, Basingstoke, 2002, pp. 51-75, p. 67.

⁵⁹⁶ L. Grossman, 'Pushkin i dendizm', *Etudy o Pushkine*, Moscow-Petrograd, 1923, pp. 5-36, p. 14.

⁵⁹⁷ O. Vainshtein, 'Russian Dandyism: Constructing a Man of Fashion', p. 59.

fits neatly within the genre of Romantic portraiture, particularly as a portrait of a writer. One imagines Pushkin, visiting the Russian capital after an absence of seven years and apparently on a quest to find a wife, appeared as Kiprenskii portrayed him – smart, groomed and fashionable. But St. Petersburg observers noted that Pushkin ‘stood out...in clothes that were not of St. Petersburg cut, and an extremely odd hat’.⁵⁹⁸ This is not the Pushkin represented here – although his famously long fingernails are prominently on display – here Pushkin’s dress conforms both to European fashion in dress and painting; the “Russianness” conveyed by the *khalat* has been replaced by some Scottish tartan, a reference perhaps to Sir Walter Scott, of whom Pushkin was a great admirer and who was central in popularising tartan at the beginning of the nineteenth century.⁵⁹⁹ The tartan, unlike the muse statuette, sometimes figured in the representations of Pushkin based on Kiprenskii’s portrait, but it was not one of the central elements of the Pushkin iconography, it was reproduced as just a drape of material in Utkin’s copy and Wright did not include it in his portrait, perhaps to avoid charges of imitating Kiprenskii.

There are three major elements in the Kiprenskii portrait that cannot be underestimated: Pushkin’s hair, side whiskers and a bow tie/neck tie. Tropinin’s portrait had skilfully presented the first two, but the bow tie was first presented in Kiprenskii’s portrait (it is absent from the Vivien-Chateaubriand portraits) and although it may seem a trivial item when discussing the representation of Russia’s national poet, in terms of a Pushkin iconography in the second half of the nineteenth century it is paramount. The bow tie and the mass of curly hair became the key visual signifiers that a portrait was a portrait of Pushkin. For example, a silhouette of Pushkin was used to illustrate an 1883 article on light and colour in an educational magazine. Pushkin’s hair is the most notable feature (a bow tie is also present) and although his name is given below, his iconography must have been firmly established in Russian public consciousness for it to be used in a publication aimed at children.⁶⁰⁰ In 1899 perhaps some of

⁵⁹⁸ Binyon, *Pushkin*, p. 264.

⁵⁹⁹ ‘...and the differentiated “clan tartans” are an even later invention. They were designed as part of a pageant devised by Sir Walter Scott...’ p. 19, H. Trevor-Roper, ‘The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland’, in E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 15-41.

the cheapest souvenirs for sale were small rosettes of cardboard and coloured crepe paper (Fig. 110). On to these had been stuck very basic black and white portraits of Pushkin, the facial features of which are difficult to discern but the poet can be identified by the hairstyle and bow tie. The strong association of Pushkin with the bow tie is illustrated in this sketch that appeared in the satirical paper, *The Dragonfly (Strekoza)* in 1899:

‘In the factory shop.’

Hey – Vas’ka, now Pushkin is in fashion, you must market the bow-ties, that we dumped in the back of the cupboard from a delivery 3 years ago, sell them in the window with the following slogan: “Hey there, bow-ties à la Pushkin” – in a flash they’ll be bought up. – I’ll do it right away ... and perhaps put out some braces with such an advertisement too?”⁶⁰¹

Kiprenskii’s portrait immediately caught the public and critics’ attention when it was exhibited at the Academy exhibition in September 1827 and then engraved by Russia’s premier engraver Nikolai Ivanovich Utkin (1780-1863) for the journal *Severnye tsvety na 1828 goda (Northern Flowers, 1828)*, published by Del’vig. Contemporaries of Pushkin believed both the original portrait by Kiprenskii and Utkin’s engraving, were marvellous likenesses. E.A Baratynskii writing to Pushkin told his friend, ‘Your portrait in *Northern Flowers* is an extraordinary likeness and beautifully engraved, Del’vig gave me a special copy of it.’⁶⁰² A number of painted copies were made of Kiprenskii’s work throughout the nineteenth century⁶⁰³ – most famously Nikolai Nikolaevich Ge’s 1875 version – but it was through engravings and lithographs that Kiprenskii’s portrait entered the public sphere most effectively. *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* in 1883 described it as the ‘most disseminated of Pushkin’s portraits’.⁶⁰⁴

The first engraving of Kiprenskii’s portrait was made by Utkin, one of the most respected engravers working in Russia⁶⁰⁵ and his reproduction was described by

⁶⁰⁰ A. Betkhera, ‘V chem zakliuchaetsia tsvet?’, *Detskoe chtenie*, no.4, April-June 1883, pp. 96-108. Other silhouettes used are of Dostoevskii and Shakespeare. The only non-writer deemed recognisable enough to be included was Peter I.

⁶⁰¹ Quoted in M. Kublitskaia, ‘Tepericha Pushkin v mode...’, in *Doma u Pushkina*, special edition of *Ars Peterburg, Rossiiskii zhurnal iskusstva*, St. Petersburg, 1994, pp. 91-95, p. 93.

⁶⁰² E.A. Baratynskii-A.S. Pushkin, end of February, beginning of March 1828, quoted in Ia. V. Bruk (ed.), *Orest Kiprenskii. Perepiska, dokumenty, svidetel'stva sovremennikov*, St. Petersburg, 1994, p. 449.

⁶⁰³ See Librovich, *Pushkin* pp. 26-28 and Grand Duke Nikolai Mikhailovich, *Russkie portrety XVIII i XIX vekov*, pp. 209-210 for details on painted copies of the portrait and their locations.

⁶⁰⁴ *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* no. 46, 12 November 1883, p. 1.

Rovinskii as the 'greatest likeness of the portrait of Pushkin'.⁶⁰⁶ After its appearance in *Severnnye tsvety*, it then featured as a supplement to the second edition of *Ruslan and Liudmilla* in 1828⁶⁰⁷ and in the posthumous edition of the selected works of Pushkin in 1838. Utkin claimed that Pushkin himself had asked the engraver to make another version but the writer died before he could receive it.⁶⁰⁸ The 1838 engraving was slightly altered, it was a steel plate engraving (the original had been copper plate) in which the 'expression of the eyes is different, the nose is shorter, the cheeks and lips appeared thinner, the chin wider'.⁶⁰⁹

However these differences are irrelevant when the portrait was continually reproduced and modified by other engravers. As can be seen Utkin's engraving is a skilled piece of workmanship, but even though this first reproduction was published, literary almanacs were expensive and had limited circulation and therefore, the work's greatest significant lies with the 'whole mass of engravings, lithographs, photographic and other copies'⁶¹⁰ that were taken from it or it inspired.

In some cases a printed portrait is clearly a reproduction of the Kiprenskii portrait and not of the Utkin engraving. For example, in the album of 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition the portrait includes the muse statuette, removed by Utkin. Yet the Kiprenskii portrait and the Utkin engraving should be considered 'as one' when we examine their presence in late imperial Russia. The major difference between the two is the removal of the muse figure. Utkin also removed Pushkin's hand from the first engraving that appeared in 1828 but in the 1838 version it reappeared. In subsequent portraits that appeared based on Kiprenskii/Utkin the hand and those long fingernails sometimes feature, sometimes do not. What Utkin did do was depict Pushkin's bow tie with greater

⁶⁰⁵ Utkin was both fellow of the Imperial Academy of Arts in Paris and an Academician in St. Petersburg. In addition he was curator of engraving at the Hermitage (1817-1850). *St. Petersburg. A Portrait of a City and its Citizens*, p. 477.

⁶⁰⁶ D.A. Rovinskii, *Nikolai Ivanovich Utkin, ego zhizn' i proizvedeniia*, St. Petersburg, 1884, p. 136.

⁶⁰⁷ Adariukov, *Ukazatel'*, no. 8, p. 6.

⁶⁰⁸ G. Koka, 'Portret Pushkina', *Tvorchestvo*, no. 2, 1962, pp. 23-24.

⁶⁰⁹ Adariukov, *Ukazatel'*, pp. 6-7. Adariukov also notes, interestingly, that this version was considered inferior to the original as Pushkin's 'African features' (*Africanskie cherty*) were not expressed as strongly as before.

⁶¹⁰ Librovich, *Pushkin*, pp. 31-32.

clarity and definition and therefore cement one of the key elements of the Pushkin iconography. Kiprenskii and Utkin both produced engaging, skilled portraits that presented Pushkin in a Romantic manner. The success of the Kiprenskii / Utkin portrait relies on the expression of Pushkin's psyche and creative strength, and the establishment of a definite iconography. The first factor made it the portrait that others wanted to reproduce, the second factor made it possible for all types and standards of reproductions to be associated with this particular Pushkin. For example, a *politipazh* of the Utkin engraving (Fig. 111) that appeared in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* in 1837, and which Librovič highlights for attention because it was so awful,⁶¹¹ is still recognizable as Pushkin. The reproduction does nothing for the poet's face, which looks as if heavily caked in make-up, but the curly hair, the long side whiskers and the bow tie are all identifiable. In a cheap (fifty-kopeck) booklet published to coincide with the opening of the Moscow monument another Kiprenskii/Utkin portrait appears⁶¹² (Fig. 112). This portrait includes the poet's hand and has added a background that could be taken for billowing clouds, but what it also does is demonstrate one of the regular features of poor quality reproductions of Pushkin's portrait. As if to compensate for the inability to reproduce the nuances of the poet's facial features and expression, they exaggerate his hair and side whiskers. Compare this portrait with the Kiprenskii original and there is decidedly more hair. This again demonstrates the importance of Pushkin's hair in his iconography.

The Kiprenskii/Utkin portrait provided the basis for the great mass of subsequent visual representations of the writer. Nowhere is this more evident than from a page in the album of the 1899 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition. It consisted of a collection of ten portraits of Pushkin (Fig. 113) all produced in 1837, and of these only one was based on the Tropinin portrait. The rest, as the album stated, are 'taken from Kiprenskii and from Utkin.'⁶¹³ Yet the Kiprenskii/Utkin portraits were not alone in establishing the Pushkin

⁶¹¹ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 91.

⁶¹² A. Filonov, *Poet Pushkin. Obshchedostupnoe chtenie*, St. Petersburg, 1880, frontispiece.

⁶¹³ *Al'bom Pushkinskoi vystavki ustroennoi Obshchestvom liubiteli rossiiskoi slovesnosti v zalakh Istoricheskogo muzeia v Moskve 29 maia-13 iunia 1899g.*, Moscow, 1899, inventory no. 15, p. 2.

iconography and a final mention must be made of the last portrait executed of the poet whilst he was alive by the British engraver Thomas Wright.

The Wright Engraving

Thomas Wright (1792-1849) was a British born engraver who worked in St. Petersburg in 1820s and 1830s. One of his earliest commissions was from Aleksandr I for an engraved collection of the 'Military Gallery' from the Winter Palace; these were published in 1822 as *Sobraniia portretov voennoi galerei*.⁶¹⁴ However, his most reproduced work must be his 1837 engraved portrait of Pushkin. At first glance it seems that Wright's portrait of Pushkin is an adaptation of Kiprenskii's painting or Utkin's engraving. There are a number of strong similarities: the position of Pushkin's head, it is turned slightly to left and the poet's eyes are focused on something outside of the picture. Pushkin's clothes initially seem the same too, but on closer inspection there are differences. There is no drape of tartan across the poet's right shoulder and in general the poet's appearance in Wright's portrait is slightly smarter. Pushkin's bow tie is smaller, tied tighter and does not protrude across his jacket collar in the way it does in the Kiprenskii portrait. His shirtfront is visible and his outer jacket or frock coat has a stronger definition in the engraving. The absence of Pushkin's hands in Wright's portrait also means the absence of those long fingernails, and in general Pushkin appears clean, well groomed and smartly dressed. There is nothing about his appearance here, either in dress or physical characteristics, that reflects those unflattering descriptions of poet that litter his contemporaries' diaries and memoirs. Here, a Polish visitor to St. Petersburg and friend of the poet Mickiewicz, describes the Pushkin he met in 1827:

The carelessness of his attire, his dishevelled hair (he was somewhat bald) and side-whiskers, the distorted soles, and especially heels of his shoes, were evidence not only of a lack of attention to his appearance, but also of slovenliness.⁶¹⁵

This description we might be able to associate with the Tropinin Pushkin, but not with the one by Kiprenskii, Utkin, or Wright. Those particular aspects of Pushkin's personal identity described by the Pole have been replaced with

⁶¹⁴ D.A. Rovinskii. *Podrobnyi slovar Russkikh graverov XVI-XIX vv*, p. 821. Wright was nominated to the Imperial Academy of Arts in 1824 and made an academician in 1836.

⁶¹⁵ Stanislaw Morawski, quoted in Binyon, *Pushkin*, p. 271.

smartness and good grooming. The hair in the Kiprenskii portrait is slightly dishevelled and in the Wright engraving Pushkin's locks are less voluminous, but neither portrait could be said to represent 'slovenliness'.

Wright's engraving was first issued as an individual print following Pushkin's death at a price of five roubles and then according to Adariukov the portrait did not significantly reappear until the 1880s.⁶¹⁶ However when it did start to be reproduced again, along with the Kiprenskii/Utkin portrait, it became one the most reproduced portraits of the poet, offering perhaps a less confrontational and more genteel Pushkin.

This section has attempted to outline those representations of Pushkin created during his lifetime by Geitman, Tropinin, Kiprenskii, Utkin, and Wright. One, or a number of these images of Pushkin, were always present in an illustrated collection of his works, a biographical study, or a commemorative leaflet. One of the first picture postcards issued in Russia in 1895 featured a sketch of the Pushkin monument; and one of the largest publishers of Russian picture postcards, the Society of Saint Evgeniia (the Russian Red Cross), featured the Geitman and Kiprenskii portraits amongst its first issues.⁶¹⁷

However, of the five portraits it was those of Kiprenskii, Utkin, and Wright, which established the definite Pushkin iconography that subsequent portraits would adhere to. These three representations of Pushkin emphasised the individual spirit of the poet, whilst also presenting him as fashionable well dressed young man. This latter factor partly explains why companies were so keen to place this particular Pushkin on their products' packaging; the poet himself looked like someone who might buy (or at least could afford) items such as chocolates, tobacco and toiletries; here was an individual whose intelligence and appearance the consumer would wish to be associated with. As Pushkin became one of Russia's most notable figures, events from his personal life and his tragic demise came to be as important in representations of him as his

⁶¹⁶ Adariukov, *Ukazatel'*, p. 9.

⁶¹⁷ On the history of Pushkin postcards see M.S. Zabochen, "*Ia k vam pishu...*" *Pushkiniana na otkrytykh XIX-XXvv*, Moscow, 1999. The history of postcards in Russia has been subject to recent scholarly research. On the activities of the Russian Red Cross see V.P. Tret'iakov, *Otkrytye pis'ma serebriannogo veka*, St. Petersburg, 2000. This includes a full inventory of all postcards issued by the Red Cross. No. 15 is given as 'Geitman. A.S. Pushkin aged 12-14' and no. 16. 'Kiprenskii. A.S. Pushkin'. Both these postcards were published in 1899. p. 277. An outstanding detailed history of picture postcards in Russia from 1895-1917 is provided by M.V. Nashchokina, *Khudozhestvennaia otkrytyka russkogo moderna*, Moscow, 2004.

achievements as a writer. One of the other pictures issued in post card form by the Red Cross was a reproduction of Ge's picture *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* (1875) and the following section will examine how professional artists from the 1870s onwards depicted Pushkin, developing on those portraits created during the poet's lifetime.

Section ii. A.S. Pushkin in late imperial Russia, Celebration and Commercialization

In general, portraits of Pushkin that appeared after his death, have made considerable transgressions and thanks to these unfortunate representations – many people now have a quite distorted and incorrect notion of the appearance of the wonderful poet.⁶¹⁸

As already mentioned in the previous section, a revival in the visual representation of Pushkin began to take place in the 1870s. This accompanied a renewed interest in Pushkin's life and works; the 1870s saw the reprinting of P.V. Annenkov's *Materialy dlia biografii Aleksandra Sergeevicha Pushkina* which was first issued in 1855 and republished in 1873. In addition Annenkov also published a second biographical work on Pushkin, *Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin v Alesksandrovsuiu epokhu: 1799-1826* in the following year.⁶¹⁹ With reference to visual culture, the campaign for the construction of a monument to Pushkin once more gathered momentum, after becoming dormant for a number of years. In 1871 Aleksandr II officially approved a committee for the raising of funds and construction of a monument and in 1872 sanctioned the choice of Tverskoi boulevard, Moscow as its location. By 1871 funds for the construction of a monument had reached over 10,375 roubles and were increasing by around three thousand roubles a month.⁶²⁰ The repeated reproduction of the five portraits previously discussed began to occur slowly at this time. Fig. 114 shows a reproduction of the Geitman engraving (which has been drawn and subsequently engraved again) on the front cover of *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* in 1875.⁶²¹ Underneath the portrait the editor has provided the title 'A.S. Pushkin, 27 years of age' a rather old approximation of his age in this portrait! The copyists have rather exaggerated Pushkin's features in the engraving, his hair is more abundant and curly, his eyes deeper set, his eye brows further arched. As with all journals, *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* repeated its images over the years and

⁶¹⁸ Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 113.

⁶¹⁹ P.V. Annenkov, *Materialy dlia biografii Aleksandra Sergeevicha Pushkina*, St. Petersburg, 1855 and 1873; *Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin v Aleksandrovsuiu epokhu: 1799-1826*, St. Petersburg, 1874. Bibliographical information taken from M.A. Tsiavlovskii (comp.), *Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva A.S. Pushkina 1799-1826*, Leningrad 1991, p. 688.

⁶²⁰ M.C. Levitt, *Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880*, New York, 1989, pp. 47-49.

⁶²¹ *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 361, 29 November 1875.

this version of the Geitman engraving resurfaced in its 1887 Pushkin anniversary issue. However, now it was entitled 'A.S. Pushkin as a youth' and entered the debate of the originator of the portrait by stating the Geitman took his engraving from a drawing made by K.P. Briullov.⁶²² It was reprinted for a third time in 1899 in the volume *Iubileinyi sbornik (26 Maia 1899). Istoriko-literaturnykh stat'i o Pushkine (A Jubilee Collection (26 May 1899). Historical and literary articles about Pushkin)*.⁶²³ This time the portrait appeared with the caption 'A.S. Pushkin, 14-16 years of age'. Although this collection of articles was edited by the 'venerable trustee of the 7th Gymnasium of St. Petersburg, N.Ia. Romanov' it was printed by Edvard Hoppe's firm, therefore all nine illustrations were taken from *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*. In 1877 a reproduction of Utkin's engraving appeared in *Niva*⁶²⁴ but images of the writer do not regularly start to appear in illustrated journals until the 1880s. What the 1870s and 1880s do witness is Pushkin and his life becoming a subject of interest for professional artists.

In the condemnation levelled at the mass reproduction of Pushkin images for the 1899 Jubilee, critics would have done well to remember that respected artists made an important contribution in the years proceeding 1899 in bringing Pushkin visually 'back to life'. Artists expanded the range of Pushkin images available to the public and were just as much aware of the popular appeal of the poet as a factory owner or newspaper editor. A number of artists created Pushkin portraits or pictures in the 1870s and 1880s that joined the 'canon' of Pushkin representations. This does not necessarily mean that they were particularly artistically outstanding or innovative works, quite the opposite; they conformed to the already established iconography of Pushkin and merely developed it further.

One artist who did attempt to innovate, rather than replicate, in his depiction of the poet was the respected engraver Lev Evgrafovich Dmitriev-Kavkazskii (1849-1916) whose etched portrait of Pushkin (1880) (Fig. 115) was, according to Librovich, 'most curious and unique'.⁶²⁵ As a separate print, the portrait was issued four times, with slight modifications to each edition. It first

⁶²² *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 941, 24 January 1887, p. 92.

⁶²³ N.Ia. Romanov (ed.), *Iubileinyi sbornik (26 maia 1899). Istoriko-literaturnykh statei o Pushkine*, St. Petersburg, 1899.

⁶²⁴ *Niva*, no. 18, 1877, p. 285. Adariukov, *Ukazatel'*, no. 74, p. 12.

⁶²⁵ Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 104.

appeared with a small portrait of Dostoevskii in the bottom left hand corner; a visual reference to the writer's famous speech given at the unveiling of Opekushin's monument. The second issue contained a copy of the engraver's signature, the third the year and the fourth some lines from Pushkin.⁶²⁶ However, with reference to its appearance in journals, books, and consumer items the print was not popular. As far as I have been able to discern it was only reproduced in Librovič's book⁶²⁷ and on the front cover of the 'Pushkin' issue of *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* in 1887.⁶²⁸ Two versions of it were shown in the main 1899 Pushkin Exhibition held at the Academy of Sciences but it was not reproduced in the accompanying album.⁶²⁹ Certainly, no companies felt that this was the Pushkin they wanted to associate with their products.⁶³⁰ The Pushkin presented by Dmitriev-Kavkazskii is one we have not encountered in previous representations. Although he is wearing a suit, it is cut much tighter to the body, the lapels are narrower, the bow-tie smaller. Unlike other portraits Pushkin is presented face on, rather than at an angle, and those facial features associated with his African origins are more pronounced; Librovič particularly praised the engraver in this respect. Librovič had no problem with the portrait's representation of Pushkin's ethnicity, but he criticised it for not presenting Pushkin as a young man: 'in general this portrait of Pushkin is unintentionally an image, if it was at all possible, made of Pushkin of around fifty years of age if he had still been alive.'⁶³¹ It seems that youth, and those qualities associated with it – romance, adventure and rebellion – had to present for a Pushkin representation to be deemed successful.

It is not surprising therefore, that many painters turned to incidents that occurred in Pushkin's life whilst the poet was a young man, whilst still referring to the iconography established in the Kiprenskii portrait. The two most respected

⁶²⁶ Adariukov, *Ukazatel'*, no. 43, pp. 9-10.

⁶²⁷ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 103.

⁶²⁸ *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 941, 24 January 1887.

⁶²⁹ *Pushkinskaia iubileinaia vystavka v Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk v S. Peterburge. Katalog*, St. Petersburg, 1899, nos. 194 and 195 p. 24.

⁶³⁰ It would have also been available to purchase as an individual portrait from book shops and other similar establishments. Locating data on these sales proved difficult which is why this thesis focused on prints published in bound volumes and journals. Although Rovinskii provides detailed information on prints, these are from his own private collection and do not therefore fairly represent what was available to all purchasers; some prints Rovinskii lists are incredibly rare or expensive.

⁶³¹ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 104.

artists in the second half of the nineteenth century to depict scenes from the poet's life were N.N. Ge and Ivan Konstantinovich Aivazovskii (1817-1900).

Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe

In 1875 the fourth *Peredvizhniki* exhibition toured Russia, visiting the cities of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Khar'kov, Odessa, Kiev and for the first time, Iaroslavl'.⁶³² Amongst the eighty-three works of art on display, visitors to the exhibition would have been able to see two Pushkin based works, both by N.N. Ge. Ge, whose previous history painting *Peter I and his son Aleksei* had drawn in the crowds and impressed the critics at the first *Peredvizhniki* exhibition once again received great attention for his picture *Pushchin visiting Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* (1875) (Fig. 90). Also in the exhibition was a copy Ge made of the Kiprenskii portrait of Pushkin, but this was overshadowed by the artist's original work. *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* is not a portrait of Pushkin in the traditional sense but it is one of the most significant posthumous representations of the poet in what is best described as a history painting. For not only does Ge depict a moment from the past, from Pushkin's life, the work attempts to inspire in the viewer feelings of admiration for the spirit of Pushkin, despite his treatment by the tsarist authorities. In the formation of Pushkin's identity in late imperial Russia it is extremely significant as it presented Pushkin as an independent spirit, engaged in literary pursuits despite his exile. However, the reaction to the picture demonstrates that the contribution made by a representation of a writer, should not simply be equated with its success as a work of art, even in the eyes of critics or the artist himself. In reflecting on *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe*, Stasov, in his book on Ge, declared 'the picture had no success whatever'. Stasov then continued stating the only reason that N.A. Nekrasov purchased the picture from Ge was because of the subject and 'not because of the art, of which he had little understanding' and that Ge himself 'felt the same about the work, despite the public declarations of its excellence and

⁶³² The fourth exhibition took the following tour: St. Petersburg, Imperial Academy of Arts, 27 February – 6 April 1875; Moscow, Moscow of School of Painting, 17 April - 1 June 1875; Khar'kov, Khar'kov university, 10 December 1875- 1 January 1876; Odessa, The English Club, 20 January – 8 February 1876; Kiev, The English Club, 21 February – 14 March 1876; Iaroslavl', The English Club, 30 March – 15 April 1876. *Tpkhv*, p. 628. According to *Tpkhv* there are no records on the number of visitors to the exhibition in St. Petersburg, Moscow or Odessa. Visitors to the other exhibitions they list as Khar'kov: 1,998, Kiev: 4,144 and Iaroslavl': 1,284. *Tpkhv*, p. 631.

success'.⁶³³ Other scholars of Ge and of the portraiture of Pushkin have also been dismissive of the work. V. Porudominskii rather snobbishly noted (especially for a Soviet scholar):

The picture by Ge *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* is very famous. It is reproduced in school text books and on the cover of exercise books. This is a bad sign. The word 'accessible' has a few interpretations; amongst these are 'easy to understand' and 'cheap'.⁶³⁴

He also claims that Ge did not believe the work a success. Ge's opinion of his finished work is somewhat irrelevant and it did not seem to influence the opinions of those in the business of reproducing images of Pushkin. Porudominskii's comments that 'there is no other such work in Ge's output to be found'⁶³⁵ far from marking Ge's work out as a low point in his career highlight the way in which Ge's picture entered the 'canon' of Pushkin images and became *the* representation of the poet at a certain time in his life. Porudominskii's remarks were targeted at twentieth-century reproductions but this process was well under way in the 1890s and Librovič declared it 'the most popular picture based on the life of Pushkin'.⁶³⁶ Indeed, one contemporary of Ge and Stasov who did recognize the work's importance was Tret'iakov. Whilst painting his 1877 portrait of Nekrasov, the painter Kramskoi mentioned in a letter to his patron that 'Nekrasov asked me to let you know, that were you to say the word, it would be possible that he would sell you his picture by Ge *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe*'.⁶³⁷ Tretiakov replied: 'I have to have Ge's picture, his fine representation of *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* you see I might have acquired it, for I proposed this picture to its creator, it came into being, but now I do not have it!'.⁶³⁸ However Tret'iakov did not acquire it and after Nekrasov's death it entered the possession of the Khar'kov collector Boris Grigor'evich Filonov and from there, into the collection of the Khar'kov art museum. Whether Tret'iakov did suggest to Ge he paint a picture of Pushkin has been impossible to ascertain but Pushkin was certainly in the public consciousness as 1874 had been the

⁶³³ Stasov, *N.N. Ge*, p. 252.

⁶³⁴ Porudominskii, *Nikolai Ge*, p. 122.

⁶³⁵ Ibid.

⁶³⁶ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 116.

⁶³⁷ Kramskoi-Tret'iakov, end of June 1877, reproduced in *Perepiska Kramskogo*, vol. I, pp. 195-196.

⁶³⁸ Tret'iakov-Kramskoi 11 July 1877, Ibid., p. 186.

seventy-fifth anniversary of the poet's birth and Ge's picture has a celebratory feel to it.

The picture, unlike most history paintings, is not large - measuring only 78 x 108 cm - yet it is full of activity and contains three figures: Pushkin, standing in the centre of the composition reciting from a manuscript, his old fellow Lycée student Ivan Ivanovich Pushchin (1798-1859) sat in an armchair listening to Pushkin and in profile to the viewer, and in background, sat on a chair knitting, Pushkin's old nanny, Arina Rodionova Iakovleva (1758-1828). The setting is one of the rooms of the house on the Pushkin family estate of Mikhailovskoe situated in the Pskov region of north-western Russia. Although Ge's picture was a work of the imagination it is based on a genuine event, the visit of Pushchin to Pushkin on 11 January 1825. Apparently Pushchin arrived at Mikhailovskoe at eight in the morning and stayed for the entire day. With lunch the old friends drank champagne and then afterwards Pushkin read aloud from A.S. Griboedov's new work *Woe from Wit* (*Gore ot uma*), a copy of which Pushchin had brought with him;⁶³⁹ it is this scene that Ge reproduces.

Pushchin was amongst those young Russian noblemen, the Decembrists, who wished to bring political change to Russia. According to Binyon, Pushkin was suspicious that Pushchin was involved in secret political activity, a fact that his friend neither confirmed nor denied.⁶⁴⁰ Ge's picture, commemorates not only Pushkin and his seventy-fiftieth anniversary, but the fiftieth anniversary of the Decembrist uprising in its depiction of Pushchin as well as the poet. The image of Pushchin was based upon an already existing portrait belonging to an acquaintance of Ge⁶⁴¹ and the image of Pushkin on the Kiprenskii portrait (which Ge copied) and a copy of Pushkin's death mask lent to Ge by T.B. Semechinka, niece of K.K. Danzas (1801-70) Pushkin's seconder in his duel with D'Anthes. The appearance of Pushkin indicates Ge's use of the Kiprenskii portrait; he even positions the writer so his head is angled to his left. He even presents him in a smart frock coat and bow tie, even though whilst at

⁶³⁹ Tsiavlovskii, *Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva A.S. Pushkina 1799-1826*, p. 492.

⁶⁴⁰ Binyon, *Pushkin*, p. 205.

⁶⁴¹ N.N. Ge-P.A. Efremov, 24 September 1874. '...tell me, do you still have that portrait of Pushchin? I really need it'. Quoted in Zograf, *Nikolai Nikolaevich Ge*, p. 90.

Mikhailovskoe Pushkin's dress would probably have been more relaxed. One local resident who encountered him gave the following description:

I had the pleasure of seeing Mr Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin, who in a way surprised me by his strange attire, to wit: he had a straw hat on his head, was wearing a red calico peasant shirt, with a sky-blue ribbon as a sash, carried an iron cane in his hand, had extremely long black side-whiskers, which were more like a beard, and also very long fingernails.⁶⁴²

Ge however, conformed to the traditional representation of Pushkin and this, combined with the setting and the characters of Pushchin and the nanny, made it the ideal picture for reviewers of the *Peredvizhniki* exhibition to engage with and describe to their readers – like Ge's previous painting of a great Russian figure, Peter I, *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* gave the critics a subject to talk about that they knew their readership would have at least some knowledge of.

The review that appeared in *The Bee (Pchela)* indicates that shared knowledge of Pushkin also included an awareness of his portraits and the critic refers to, presumably, the Geitman engraving and the Kiprenskii portrait.

...in the picture by Mr Ge, Pushkin is represented in his youth: the task of the artist consequently consisted in reviving for us that image of the poet at this age in accordance with the two widely known portraits – one that is close to our hearts, representing Pushkin as a boy, and the other, representing him in his mature age; this task Mr Ge fulfilled with success, and the expression of this young, inspired face, in our opinion, is also highly satisfactory. But when after the first pleasing impression you approach the picture closer, here the disappointment begins. In the figure of the Nanny and in the figure of Pushchin are manifested mistakes of drawing and poorness of quality, and you cannot help saying: 'What a pity, that such a nice idea is spoilt by insufficient carefulness in execution.'⁶⁴³

The mixed comments of the *Pchela* critic reflect the general attitude of critics - they warmed to the theme, but felt its delivery was not up to Ge's usual high artistic standard. However the opportunities the picture gave critics for colourful descriptions of it guaranteed it received attention, and with great detail tried to bring the work alive for their readers.

As regards Mr Ge's Pushkin, judging by the descriptions that have reached me so far, I expected something far bigger. I do not mean the

⁶⁴² Local tradesman Ivan Lapin quoted in Binyon, *Pushkin*, pp. 200-201.

⁶⁴³ 'Chetvertaia peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Pchela*, no.10, 16 March 1875, pp. 121-126, p. 124.

work but the actual subject. The face of the poet is perfectly fixed. It is difficult to make out with any certainty at all exactly what he is reading to Pushchin. The grimace of the latter, in my opinion, perhaps can be taken as none other than the effort to catch the thread of the poem: as though the listener was thinking 'quite about something else', but then suddenly feeling, in the intonation of the reading, the nearness of the finale and prepares to say something to the question 'what do you think?' [In this case the critic thought the depiction of the subjects admirable] ...In particular, the foreshortening of the right hand of Pushkin is beyond criticism. In its general outline, the picture has been painted skilfully; in any case, it must not pass by unnoticed in the chronicles of contemporary Russian art.⁶⁴⁴

Although it was not a work of artistic brilliance, because of the artist and the subject it received a great deal of coverage in the press and people were made aware of it. One of the longest reviews appeared in *Moskovskie vedomosti* as the critic quoted from length from Pushchin's memoirs.

For those who have not seen the exhibition, but have read accounts about it in the Petersburg newspapers or the letters of Petersburg correspondents, the picture by Mr N. Ge *Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe* must arouse the greatest curiosity [...] Ge was able to find a task that was interesting not for him alone, but also for the entire public. In the picture Pushkin is not presented alone, but together with another young man. This other all have identified as Pushchin, a Lycée comrade and friend of Pushkin. Pushchin recounted in his notes about the visit to the place of Pushkin's exile in his father's village Mikhailovskoe. It is this story so charming in its details that deserves a good picture, so who can blame me if I put it here: [large quote from Pushchin followed][...]It is doubtless that the story set forth above inspired Mr Ge, but the story by Pushchin remains incomparably better than the picture. From all the interesting moments of the meeting of Pushchin with the poet, Mr Ge illustrates the one when Pushkin reads aloud *Woe from Wit* or his own works. Pushkin has been represented standing with his back to a table, one foot behind the other, in one hand holding a manuscript, the other gesticulating; Pushchin is faced opposite him sprawled in a deep armchair. The expression of Pushkin is somewhat vague; less than enthusiastic or even excited. The facial features recall the famous portraits of Pushkin, but the character of them is not quite what one is used to associate with the name of the poet; in Mr Ge's Pushkin there is something tearful about him.⁶⁴⁵

⁶⁴⁴ N. K...v, 'Chetvertaia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin v shkole zhivopisi i vaianiia', *Sovremennye izvestiia*, no. 112, 26 April 1875, p. 2.

⁶⁴⁵ P...nii, '4-ia peredvizhnaia vystavka v Moskve', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 124, 18 May 1875, p. 4.

Even if reviewers deliberated over Ge's effectiveness in representing Pushkin, the public was not put off and wanted to see the work for themselves. The critic for *Golos* noted that although in his opinion there were a number of good genre pictures on show by Makovskii and Maksimov as well as by Ge, 'of all these most of the public's attention centres itself on the picture by Ge'. Which the critic then declares 'a wonderfully successful choice of subject, borrowed from the life of our favourite national poet, irrespective of others it ranks in first place and gives it the right to be generally liked.'⁶⁴⁶ Sometimes newspapers carried two reviews of differing opinions, as was the case with *Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti*. The main review, which appeared in the feuilleton section on 28 March, was a lengthy article that quoted lines from Pushkin and analysed each part of the picture. In general, the reviewer liked the picture, 'the picture by professor Ge is one of the best works in the exhibition', but felt it was the subject, rather than the way it was painted, that guaranteed its success and popularity: 'this idea [to take an episode from Pushkin's life] excites the curiosity of the audience, attaches life to the picture and redeems some of the very noticeable technical shortcomings.'⁶⁴⁷ However a previous commentator for the paper, who attended the exhibition when it opened and was annoyed from the start as no catalogue or *ukazatel'* had been prepared in time, expressed a similar opinion to his colleague but in a less sympathetic manner: 'As an illustration to a biography of Pushkin it is invaluable, as a historical picture it is not a success.'⁶⁴⁸

In criticising the picture the *Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti* journalist highlights how it became one of the most popular representations of Pushkin and why it entered the 'canon' of Pushkin images. As well as being exhibited at the *Peredvizhniki* exhibition, it was shown at the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition and a photograph of it was included in the 1899 Pushkin Exhibition at the Academy of Sciences. But it was not as an exhibit that it grew to be known, but as an illustration to the many works about Pushkin that appeared in the 1880s

⁶⁴⁶ 'Chetvertaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', *Golos*, 25 March 1875, pp. 2-4, p. 3.

⁶⁴⁷ 'Chetvetaia peredvizhnaia vystavka v Akademii khudozhestv', *Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti*, no. 85, 28 March 1875, pp. 1-2, p. 1.

⁶⁴⁸ V...ov, 'Iz Peterburgskoi zhizni. Otkrytye 4-oi peredvizhnoi vystavki', *Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti*, no. 59, 2 March 1875, p. 2.

and 1890s. Its first appearance in a publication was in 1875 in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* and according to Adariukov's inventory the other major illustrated journals including *Ogonek*, *Niva*, and *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* all soon reproduced a copy too.⁶⁴⁹ Of course, *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* repeated it in its 1887 Pushkin edition but it was in the 1890s that the picture seemed to be in every publication. In 1899 Ge was also on the way to becoming a legendary Russian cultural figure, having passed away five years previously, which perhaps added to the appeal of the picture. Yet the most significant aspect about the picture, at least for publishers, was its subject. It showed a time from the poet's life when he was in his mid twenties, in exile and it bridged a gap in Pushkin's visual heritage. The Geitman engraving provided a representation of the poet as a youth, the Kiprenskii and Tropinin portraits represented Pushkin the established poet, and Ge's picture operated as a link between the two. Ge's picture was a great benefit to the compiler of a Pushkin collection or the Pushkin biographer. For example, *Pushkinskii sbornik*, a publication aimed at children and families, included a biographical essay 'Pushchin v Mikhailovskoe'.⁶⁵⁰ This simplified tale of Pushkin's time at his estate and Pushchin's visit to him was accompanied by some of the most badly executed depictions of the writer ever to be seen on the printed page; in response to Pushchin's surprise arrival Pushkin appears slightly deranged rather than pleased to see his friend. (Although given the earlier description of Pushkin's odd appearance, perhaps these pictures are closer to the truth of the poet's appearance whilst in exile) (Fig. 116). However, amidst these crude drawings a reproduction of Ge's picture also appeared, admittedly seeming rather out of place.⁶⁵¹ *Pushkinskii sbornik* demonstrates that no biographical overview of Pushkin's life could afford to exclude Ge's picture. *Pamiati A.S. Pushkina*, published by *Zhizn'* magazine, was an extremely serious collection of essays on aspects of Pushkin's life and literature with titles such as 'The theme of death in the poetry of Pushkin'.⁶⁵² Although it featured no written biography of the poet, it did have a number of pictures including Ge's, alongside

⁶⁴⁹ Adariukov, *Ukazatel'* no. 156-168, p. 17.

⁶⁵⁰ V.P. Avenarius, 'Pushchin v sele Mikhailovskom', in D.I. Tikhomirov (ed.), *Pushkinskii sbornik*, Moscow, 1899, pp. 182-212.

⁶⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 210.

⁶⁵² A.S. Izgoev, 'Smert' v poezii A.S. Pushkina', *Pamiati A.S. Pushkina. Iubileinyi sbornik*, St. Petersburg, 1899, pp. 149-158.

reproductions of the portraits by Kiprenskii and Wright.⁶⁵³ In 1899 Ge's picture also appeared in the St. Petersburg City Duma's publication *Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin*, although it was presented with a somewhat inaccurate title: 'Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe reading to Del'vig from *Evgenii Onegin*.'⁶⁵⁴

Ge's picture was one of the most frequently reproduced pictures of Pushkin that was not a portrait. However, it was not reproduced on commercial items such as cigarette cartons or chocolate bar wrappers. One reason for this was that it was a complex image to reproduce, in which the face of Pushkin was not particularly prominent. It may also have been that its political implications were not aspects of the poet's character that manufacturers wished to have associated with their products. If pictures were reproduced they emphasised the romantic or tragic aspects of Pushkin's life, not the political.

One painter who managed to avoid overt political associations in his representations of the poet was I.K. Aivazovskii, even though, like Ge, his Pushkin pictures are all based around the time in the poet's life when Pushkin was in exile.

Aivazovskii and Pushkin

Aivazovskii's career spanned the nineteenth century, longer than any other Russian artist. In 1836, Aivazovskii had apparently met Pushkin and his wife at the Academy exhibition where the young artist had seven paintings on show.⁶⁵⁵ Yet the artist was not to turn to Pushkin as a subject until 1868, when he painted a work entitled *Pushkin on the Black Sea Coast (Pushkin na beregu Chernogo moria)*.⁶⁵⁶ Aivazovskii was, and still is, best known for his dramatic scenes of ship, seas and Russian and European coastlines. His paintings that include images of Pushkin are all based on the time in Pushkin's life when he was in exile in southern Russia and living near the Black Sea and the poem he composed there, *To the Sea (K moriu)*. Aivazovskii executed as many as ten

⁶⁵³ *Pamiati A.S. Pushkina* included a variety of Pushkin images. As well as reproductions of the portraits of Kiprenskii and Wright, the pictures of Ge and Aivazovskii and Repin there were also photographs of Pushkin's nanny's cottage and the steps to Pushkin's tomb. Also reproductions of Opekushin's statue and a statue by P.P. Zabello.

⁶⁵⁴ V.P. Ostrogorskii (comp.), *Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin*, St. Petersburg, 1899, p. XVI.

⁶⁵⁵ G. Caffiero & I. Samarine, *Seas, Cities and Dreams: The Paintings of Ivan Aivazovsky*, London, 2000, p. 33.

⁶⁵⁶ I.K. Aivazovskii, *Pushkin on the Black Sea Coast*, o/c, 77.5x115 cm. ARPM.

pictures that featured Pushkin,⁶⁵⁷ most of which are similar to one another and in which Pushkin plays a secondary role to Aivazovskii's depiction of seas, sunsets and jagged coast lines. As Librovič notes 'Pushkin is only an elemental extra, standing one could say, in the background and strictly speaking the pictures of Professor Aivazovskii can hardly count as historical pictures of the life of Pushkin.'⁶⁵⁸ There is nothing remarkable in Aivazovskii's presentation of Pushkin, the artist conforms to the established Pushkin iconography – side whiskers, dark curly hair, bow tie, in some cases the figure of Pushkin is so faint and overshadowed by the seascape that it is only these signs that tell the viewer it is Pushkin.

As these were paintings by Aivazovskii, they were exhibited and occasionally reproduced. *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* placed *A.S. Pushkin in the Crimea by the Rocks at Gurzuf* on a front cover in 1881 and again printed it again in its 1887 Pushkin issue.⁶⁵⁹ Critics were mixed in their opinions of Aivazovskii's various Pushkin based pictures, but on the whole did not think his representations of the poet particularly successful. In reviewing *Pushkin on the Black Sea Coast* the critic of *Khudozhestvennye novosti* wrote 'Pushkin has turned out quite unsuccessfully [...] his face in particular has turned out quite badly, not at all in keeping with everything else.'⁶⁶⁰

Aivazovskii's representations of Pushkin may have been forgotten if it were not for his collaboration with I.E. Repin on a work that is given various titles: *Pushkin's Farewell to the Sea*; *To the Sea*; *Pushkin on the Black Sea Coast*; *Pushkin on the Seashore: Farewell ye proudly rolling waters*. All these

⁶⁵⁷ Caffiero & Samarine, *Seas, Cities and Dreams: The Paintings of Ivan Aivazovsky*, list ten paintings by Aivazovskii that feature Pushkin. However, as works by the painter re-enter the market from private collections this figure could rise. Caffiero and Samarine base their figures on two sources, N.P. Sobko's inventory of Aivazovskii's paintings executed up to 1893 and N. Barasov's inventory of Aivazovskii's paintings in Soviet collections in 1962:

Pushkin on the Black Sea Coast, 1868; *Aleksandr Pushkin at the Sea*, 1880; *A.S. Pushkin in the Crimea by the rocks at Gurzuf*, 1880; *Pushkin on the Crimean Coast*, 1886; *Pushkin on the Crimean shore, near Gurzuf with the Raevskii family*, 1886; *Pushkin's Farewell to the Sea*, 1887; *Pushkin on the Black Sea Coast*, 1887; *Pushkin on the seashore near Theodosia*, 1888; *Pushkin looking out to Sea from the Crimean coast*, 1889; *Pushkin on the Banks of the Black Sea*, 1897.

⁶⁵⁸ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 132. Librovič, however, gives different dates to Caffiero and Samarine. He claims that Aivazovskii made his first Pushkin picture in 1880, however Pavlova also dates the first Pushkin picture as 1868 and reproduces an image of it.

⁶⁵⁹ *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 672, 21 November 1881. *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 941, 24 April 1887, p.88.

⁶⁶⁰ V.V. Chuiko, 'Godichnaia akademicheskaia vystavka, *Khudozhestvennye novosti*, no. 7, 1888, quoted in Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 139.

refer to an 1887 picture (Fig. 117)⁶⁶¹ that was an artistic collaboration between Aivazovskii – sky, seas, rocks, and Repin – the figure of Pushkin.⁶⁶² This picture could be regarded as something of a Russian artistic tour-de-force, two of Russia's best known painters depicting Russia's favourite writer. Yet because the work is not typical of either painter, it is rarely mentioned in studies of either Aivazovskii or Repin. Valkenier does not refer to it in her study of Repin⁶⁶³ and Repin himself fails to mention it at all in his memoirs *Dalekoe blizkoe*.⁶⁶⁴ V.Z. Golubev does devote a chapter to it in his work on the representation of Pushkin by Repin but it is really a reworking of Librovič's chapter on the picture with an added 'political' dimension.⁶⁶⁵

1887 was a significant year for both Pushkin and Aivazovskii, who celebrated fifty years of work as a professional artist. His collaborative piece with Repin was finished in September 1887 and immediately went on show in one of the rooms of the Shreder Fortepiano Shop in St. Petersburg and according to Librovič attracted a 'flood' of people.⁶⁶⁶ It was also a popular picture with the critics, who admired of Repin's depiction of Pushkin: 'The expression on the face of Pushkin is successfully presented.'⁶⁶⁷ 'The painting of the face has been conveyed boldly and is a very good likeness'.⁶⁶⁸ One of the most interesting aspects of the picture was its destiny. It was presented by Aivazovskii and Repin to a Russian dramatic troupe for the foyer of the Aleksandrinskii theatre. The picture was then exhibited in Moscow and St. Petersburg where the entrance charge was donated to the Society for the Assistance of Destitute Theatrical Professionals. At the time Librovič was writing, it remained hanging in the foyer of the theatre, therefore on permanent public display, albeit to a limited audience.⁶⁶⁹

⁶⁶¹ The first line to Pushkin's poem *K moriu* (*To the Sea*) 'Proshchai, svobodnaia stikhiia!' (Farewell, thou free, all conquering sea!) is often used as the heading or subheading for this picture.

⁶⁶² I.K. Aivazovskii and I.E. Repin, *To the Sea*, 1887, oil on canvas, 228x157 cm, ARPM.

⁶⁶³ Valkenier only makes one comment on Repin's depiction of Pushkin, on his later depiction of the poet in his Lycée examination which she describes as 'banal'. E.K. Valkenier, *Ilya Repin*, p. 172.

⁶⁶⁴ I.E. Repin, *Dalekoe blizkoe*, Moscow, 1953.

⁶⁶⁵ V.Z. Golubev, *Pushkin v izobrazhenii Repina*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936, pp. 7-14.

⁶⁶⁶ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 144.

⁶⁶⁷ *Russkie vedomosti*, no. 329, 1887, quoted in Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 146.

⁶⁶⁸ *Novoe vremia*, no. 4162, 1887 quoted in *ibid*.

⁶⁶⁹ Librovič, *Pushkin*, p. 147.

Although it was too late to be included in any of the events associated with the 1880 Celebration – another Aivazovskii Pushkin painting was shown at an exhibition in St. Petersburg⁶⁷⁰ – it certainly had a visual presence in 1899. Although one does not come across it with the same regularity as the Kiprenskii or Geitman portraits, it does appear in journals and commemorative publications. The Kiev Pedagogical Society's *Sbornik statei ob A.S. Pushkine* printed reproductions of Pushkin portraits and pictures at the top of each chapter of their book; the Aivazovskii-Repin work was used at the start of 'A.S. Pushkin na iuge Rossii'.⁶⁷¹ A far better reproduction of the picture was afforded a full page in *Pamiati A.S. Pushkina. Iubileinyi sbornik* issued in association with the journal *Zhizn'*, where it was entitled *A.S. Pushkin on the seashore (A.S. Pushkin na beregu moria)*. In the original painting, delicate tones of grey, green, and blue were masterfully presented by Aivazovskii, and they contrasted dramatically with Repin's figure of Pushkin, entirely clad in black. However, the technical constraints of early chromolithography meant that the tonal nuances of the work could not be reproduced exactly on the cover of N. Syromiatnikov's box of 'Pushkin' caramels (Fig. 118).⁶⁷² Instead a black/white/grey reproduction of the picture was flanked by yellow and red borders and lettering. Yet it is clear that this is the Aivazovskii-Repin picture, so distinctive was Repin's positioning of the figure of Pushkin, one arm outstretched holding a top hat, the back of his cape billowing in the wind and of course, his masses of hair swept back off his face. Syromiatnikov's packaging offered consumers two Pushkin pictures, on the reverse of the box was placed A.M. Volkov's *Duel* (1869). These two pictures refer to two of the most famous episodes from the poet's life, his period of exile and his tragic death. The Aivazovskii-Repin picture, however, was also connected to his professional identity as a writer and Syromiatniko also printed the first verse of *K moriu* on the box.

It is at this point that I must make mention of Sally West's comprehensive study of advertising in late imperial Russia. West briefly refers

⁶⁷⁰ Librovich notes that 'Aivazovskii's first Pushkin picture was included in the Pushkin Exhibition, 1880, in St. Petersburg, but did not attract any special attention'. Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 134.

⁶⁷¹ *Sbornik statei ob A.S. Pushkine po povodu stoletniago iubileia*, Kiev, 1899 (published by the Kiev Pedagogical Society), p. 114.

⁶⁷² Collection ARPM.

to the use of writers' portraits in advertising and makes specific reference to Pushkin and the use of literature. West argues that the use of 'high art' images 'was a device by which to attract and recruit the educated elite into the arena of mass consumption [...] they created an implicit link between elite culture and consumer culture.'⁶⁷³ From its general appearance, we can assume that the Syromiatnikov caramels were not cheap, but their use of this Pushkin picture is not only evidence of the type of consumer the firm wished to attract, but indicates the wider treatment of Pushkin's professional identity in visual representations; that it was strongly associated with events from his personal life. When Pushkin's writing is reflected visually it emphasises romance, adventure and individuality. The Aivazovskii painting conforms to the Romantic tradition of representing writers amidst the extremes of nature; be it dark, billowing clouds, or in this case, dark, rolling waves, precariously balanced on the craggy seashore. There is no evidence of the actual process of writing, of papers, of a table, chair, writing instruments, this would emphasise the reality of writing, whereas Aivazovskii and Repin aimed to represent a less tangible creative process, the inspiration Pushkin's took from his surroundings. When we further examine the representation of Pushkin's professional identity on commercial items, we will see that the reality of his profession had only a small role to play, and that rather, Pushkin's fictitious tales and characters are visually 'brought to life' and an alternative world in which Pushkin existed alongside them was created by designer and artists. In particular, Pushkin's retelling of Russian *skazki* (fairy tales) were a popular subject for advertising campaigns.

We have looked in detail at some of the key visual representations of Pushkin created by professional artists both during his lifetime and after it. Now we address the means by which these images were made available to the Russian public. Central to any examination of the visual representation of Pushkin in late imperial Russia are the two Pushkin celebrations of 1880 and 1899.

The Pushkin Celebrations of 1880 and 1899

On 6 June 1880 the long awaited monument to A.S. Pushkin (Fig. 119) was unveiled on Tverskoi boulevard, Moscow, to the cheers of an appreciative crowd, estimated at anywhere between one hundred thousand and half a million

⁶⁷³ West, *Constructing Consumer Culture*, p. 212.

people strong.⁶⁷⁴ The statue of Pushkin was designed by Aleksandr Mikhailovich Opekushin (1841-1923) and the competition to choose a 'Pushkin' had been closely followed by the Russian press; a number of the possible designs were illustrated in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* to startling effect⁶⁷⁵ (Fig. 120). Opekushin's design was a full-length statue of Pushkin that included the principal iconography – masses of hair, side whiskers and a bow tie. Unlike Kiprenskii's portrait it does not present us with a defiant poet, but rather one deep in thought, searching for inspiration. However, like the Kiprenskii portrait it is a 'quintessentially Romantic image'⁶⁷⁶ and one that from 1880 was frequently reproduced in journals, books and on commercial items. Most journals and newspapers carried the celebrations in Moscow as one of their main stories of the summer and were keen to reflect the involvement of the public in the event. *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*'s front cover for the 1 July (Fig. 121) featured the excited public – banners, garlands and hats aloft – as prominently as the statue itself. *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie* described the moment –

the long awaited moment – the moment when the covers would fall down off the bronze figure of the poet arrived [...] a thousand-head crowd shouted *Ura* for some minutes. And there the giant poet stands, thoughtfully looking at this crowd; his peaceful pose, his downcast head that appears wonderfully attractive before the excited people.⁶⁷⁷

The events that led up to this occasion – the competition to find a design for the monument, the involvement of writers and intellectuals, the debates and arguments between those involved and the famous speech given by F.M. Dostoevskii are all discussed in M.C. Levitt's outstanding work on the 1880 Celebration, and this thesis is deeply indebted to it, in particular to the points Levitt makes on the role of Pushkin in Russian society in 1880. Levitt stresses the importance of Pushkin at this time as a potential unifying figure for a Russian society searching for stability and identity. He emphasises that Pushkin 'came to mark a neutral zone, to stand for Russian society's independence from both the state and from the self-proclaimed radicals from the left.'⁶⁷⁸ Hosking

⁶⁷⁴ Levitt, *Russian Literary Politics*, p. 83.

⁶⁷⁵ *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 24 May 1880.

⁶⁷⁶ Kelly, *Russian Literature*, p. 16.

⁶⁷⁷ 'Pushkinskii prazdnik v Moskve', *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 25, 21 June 1880, p. 467.

⁶⁷⁸ Levitt, *Russian Literary Politics*, p. 9.

also argues for the unifying force of the Pushkin 1880 celebration as ‘the event which did more than any other to crystallize literature as the bearer of Russian national identity.’⁶⁷⁹ Yet neither of these scholars examines the contribution made by the visual representation of Pushkin and how this presented the poet, on whom so many dreams and ambitions were placed, to the Russian public.

The Pushkin celebrations of 1880 and 1899 both propelled the visual representation of the writer into the public consciousness but in quite different ways and this could be seen as a reflection of the differences between the two celebrations. The 1880 event was principally organized by the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature, and although there were some small events in St. Petersburg, the celebrations centred on Moscow from the 6 to 8 June. Besides the unveiling of the statue there were other Pushkin related events including Pushkin exhibitions in both the Russian capitals.

Unlike the Pushkin Celebration of 1880, or the 1937 centenary of the poet’s death, little scholarly work has been carried out on the 1899 Jubilee⁶⁸⁰ and when it has been discussed, it is often in disparaging terms. In one of the few scholarly studies carried out on the events and activities of 1899, an essay - again by Levitt⁶⁸¹ - highlights the involvement of the Russian authorities, rather than the intelligentsia, and argues that unlike the 1880 Celebration, the 1899 Jubilee was ‘an overwhelmingly official affair’ in which the tsarist state ‘had never before taken so active a role both in using Russian literature for its own political and ideological ends and in trying to involve the masses in public life.’⁶⁸² The authorities established an official Pushkin Commission and amongst their many tasks were the organization of:

...special liturgy and requiem services for Pushkin [...] to have the imperial theatres present works by Pushkin in April and May [...] to request that all educational establishments in all ministries arrange their own celebrations; to arrange readings from Pushkin’s work’s “for the people” together with magic lantern slides of his life and works; to

⁶⁷⁹ Hosking, *People and Empire*, p. 308.

⁶⁸⁰ The 1937 Pushkin centenary resulted in a great many publications, for a recent work that focuses on the visual representation of Pushkin in that year, see Iu. Molok, *Pushkin v 1937 godu*, Moscow, 2000. For an excellent overview of the major twentieth-century Pushkin anniversary celebrations, see chapter three of Stephanie Sandler’s *Commemorating Pushkin. Russia’s Myth of a National Poet*, Stanford, 2004. Sandler argues that the nineteenth-century celebrations of Pushkin have already been subject to ‘solid scholarship’, p. 14. This point, I believe, is a contestable one, valid only in relation to studies of the literary politics surrounding these events.

⁶⁸¹ Levitt, ‘Pushkin in 1899’.

⁶⁸² Levitt, ‘Pushkin in 1899’, p. 184.

publish a special edition of Pushkin illustrated by V. Vasnetsov and to print the poet's portrait and thousands of copies of his works for free distribution to schoolchildren; to create bronze and silver medallions commemorating the Jubilee as prizes for outstanding school graduates to arrange a Pushkin exhibition...⁶⁸³

This small selection of the events that took place, not only around 26 May but throughout 1899, reflects two things. Firstly, one of the main differences between events in 1880 and those in 1899 was the sheer scale of the undertaking. Whereas in 1880 the focus was the opening of one statue in Moscow, in 1899 there were countless different events and celebrations taking place throughout the empire involving everyone from the imperial family to the provincial schoolboy. Secondly, a significant contribution was made by visual culture to the Pushkin Jubilee; although the 1880 Celebration had centred on a statue, the 1899 Jubilee was arguably a far more visual occasion. There were not only more pictures and portraits, there were also Pushkin parades, musical and dramatic evenings where the poet's tales were brought to life. However we do not dismiss the contribution made by the 1880 Celebration to the development of Pushkin's visual representation in Russia. Events in 1880 reinforced an image of Pushkin in Russian society that owed its visual heritage to Kiprenskii, Utkin and Wright, this was an image of the poet that thousands of people would have daily exposure to and the monument became part of the visual canon of Pushkin imagery. Unfortunately, the scope of this thesis does not allow for a detailed study of all the aspects of the 1880 and 1899 celebrations and so I have decided to focus on the means by which Russians were able to receive representations of the writer.

Pushkin exhibitions were held in both 1880 and 1899, in the latter year a number of exhibitions were staged by various organizations throughout the Russian Empire. How these exhibitions displayed and catalogued Pushkin, and the ways in which the exhibitions were promoted and received in the press, has previously been overlooked by scholars and so it is to this subject that we firstly turn.

⁶⁸³ Levitt, 'Pushkin in 1899', p. 185.

Pushkin on Show

As has already been noted in the first part of this thesis, exhibition culture rapidly expanded and developed in the second quarter of the nineteenth century and the Russian public increasingly demanded more from the contents and organization of the exhibitions they attended. Previously we examined exhibitions of Russian art that happened to include portraits of writers. As regards the Pushkin exhibitions, the writer was the focus, with portraits the principal means by which Pushkin's life and career were presented to a Russian audience. Portraits and paintings were not the only items on display at these events, these were not art exhibitions and they also included books, journals and personal items that had belonged to the writer. The developments in visual culture that occurred between 1880 and 1899 and the difference in scale between the two Pushkin celebrations was reflected in the Pushkin exhibitions that took place. However, there were more similarities than differences between the exhibitions of 1880 and 1899 and the way in which they presented and managed Pushkin.

As far as I have been able to establish, two Pushkin exhibitions took place in 1880, one in Moscow and one in St. Petersburg. The 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition, like most elements of the 1880 Pushkin Celebration was organized by the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature and held in the Noble Assembly Hall, Moscow and opened on 5 June. In St. Petersburg, another Society, this time the Society for the Assistance of Needy Writers and Scholars, staged their own small Pushkin exhibition later in the year, the entrance fee of which would form a 'Pushkin Fund' in order to facilitate the 'publication of outstanding literary and scholarly works.'⁶⁸⁴ Neither the Moscow nor the St. Petersburg exhibition was particularly large, and the organizers of the latter event encountered reluctance from some parties to offer their support:

The Society's exhibition committee, from July to September 1880, published in Petersburg and Moscow newspapers and sent out invitations in order to obtain items for the exhibition; but many items, well-known to the committee, were not given (For example, portraits of Pushkin: the watercolour in the Lycée, which belongs to A.N. Kul'mzin; the oil painting by Tropinin, which belongs to Princess A.M. Khilkova; the oil painting by Kiprenskii, the property of the oldest son of the poet, A.A.

⁶⁸⁴ Preface to *Katalog Pushkinskoi vystavki, ustroennoi komitetom Obshchestva dlia posobiia nuzhdaiushchimsia literatorom i uchenym*, St. Petersburg, 1880.

Pushkin.) In the exhibition there are copies, engravings, lithographs and photographs of these portraits - a copy of it by N.N. Ge in the picture gallery of Tret'iakov; the work by Mazer, which is owned by S.A. Shilov; the work by K. Briullov, the property of A.I. Koshelev; the picture by Ge, representing Pushkin and Pushchin at Mikhailovskoe, which is owned by B.G. Filonov (in Khar'kov); marble busts by Ramazanov; the property of K.T. Soldatenkov, Vitali, which is owned by Count D.A. Tolstoi, and Gal'berg; the rich collection of autographs (handwriting) which is owned by P.I. Bartenev, N.S. Tikhonravov, and others.⁶⁸⁵

This short extract demonstrates the difficulty the Russian public had in accessing original portraits of Pushkin, many of which were in the hands of private collectors who did not have the philanthropic spirit of Tret'iakov. It also highlights the reliance therefore, on reproductions – ‘copies, engravings, lithographs’- and the role these played in the Pushkin exhibitions is most revealing. It was not enough for an exhibition to contain the original portrait or one excellent copy of it; numerous reproductions of the same portrait or variations of it, were put on display next to one another so that the exhibition visitor was bombarded with similar images of Pushkin, most of which derived from the Kiprenskii/Utkin portrait. As already discussed, at the beginning of the 1880s N.P. Sobko was making endeavours to publish illustrated exhibition catalogues in order that visitors could recall the works of art at home. Although the catalogue for the 1880 St. Petersburg Pushkin Exhibition was not illustrated (it was only twenty kopecks) there was the opportunity for visitors to the event to remember Pushkin at home. On the back page of the catalogue it was advertised that the collected works of A.S. Pushkin were for sale at the exhibition, comprising six volumes printed on luxury paper at the costly sum of twenty roubles, as well as facsimiles of the poet's handwriting, ‘drawings, pictures, busts statuettes, photographs of portraits of Pushkin and a few works about him.’⁶⁸⁶ Unsurprisingly in 1880 statuettes of the Pushkin monument were especially popular, and Librovich records the craze to own one's very own miniature monument:

Even before the opening of the Moscow monument, many declared their wish to have their own version of the Opekushin statue of the poet, a small bronze or plaster of Paris reproduction. These copies were much in

⁶⁸⁵ Preface, *Katalog Pushkinskoi vystavki, ustroennoi komitetom Obshchestva dlia posobiia.*

⁶⁸⁶ Ibid., back page of catalogue.

demand and prompted A.M. Opekushin to appeal to the public with the statement that such copies of the statue ought to be managed exclusively by him, Opekushin, through his workshop in St. Petersburg.

In the Pushkin exhibition in St. Petersburg busts and statuettes - copies of the Opekushin statue were for sale. Moreover, in 1880 most plaster of Paris casts that appeared were of the Opekushin statue. One such cast, of a height of 4 arshins, was exhibited in Warsaw, at the time of the celebration of the monument.⁶⁸⁷

The construction of the monument and the celebrations that surrounded it made replicas of the statue desirable items; by purchasing one you not only came into possession of your very own Pushkin, you became part of a wider community that appreciated the great poet and its presence in your home or office could only reflect well on you. Opekushin's annoyance, however, also demonstrates the growing realisation of those in the business of image creation and reproduction of the commercial value of Pushkin. Of course, Opekushin wanted copies of his statue to be good quality, but the sculptor was also concerned that someone else was profiting from his work.

The 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition was a grander affair; it included the original Tropinin and Kiprenskii portraits, but still occupied 'only two small rooms of the Noble Assembly.'⁶⁸⁸ A sketch of the event appeared in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*⁶⁸⁹ (Fig. 122) and the exhibition appears to be typical for its time in organization, with the paintings crowding each other for space, those 'above the line' hanging rather oppressively at an angle from the wall. According to the illustration, the majority of visitors to the exhibition were fashionably dressed ladies. It is interesting to note that whilst most of the female visitors are gazing at the pictures, the male visitors appear to be scrutinizing the glass cabinets which included in their contents 'photographs of his (Pushkin) death mask'.⁶⁹⁰ This exhibition may have been small, but it was covered by the Russian press and included in F.I. Bulgakov's *Venok na pamiatnik Pushkinu*, a volume that provides a written record of the events in Moscow, Petersburg and the provinces of the Pushkin days in June. It included quotations from newspapers and

⁶⁸⁷ Librovich, *Pushkin*, pp. 223-224.

⁶⁸⁸ 'Pushkinskaia vystavka', in F.I. Bulgakov (ed.), *Venok na pamiatnik Pushkinu*, Moscow, 1880, pp. 321-328, p. 323.

⁶⁸⁹ *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 598, 21st June 1880, p. 504.

⁶⁹⁰ 'Pushkinskaia vystavka', p. 324.

journals, addresses and telegrams, verses written in honour of the day and a report on the 1880 Pushkin Exhibition.

The 1880 Exhibition set the tone for following Pushkin exhibitions and aimed to provide visitors with a visual impression not only of Pushkin, but also his family, contemporaries and the era he lived in. In addition, this exhibition included drawings of the various proposed designs for the monument. A reporter from *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* outlined the event for readers:

...in its collection busts, portraits, manuscripts and various items belonging to the late poet, portraits of his friends, relatives and those acquaintances to whom he dedicated his works. The exhibition occupies only two small rooms of the hall, in one of which are to be found portraits, engravings, books etc. and in the other various things that belonged to Pushkin. In the first room are engravings of the designs of the monument to Pushkin, entered in the competition and already known to our readers through drawings reproduced in *Vsemirnaia Illiustratsiia*. [...] In the same room stand cabinets of images of Pushkin in his coffin, a photograph of his death mask and many portraits of Pushkin: a miniature by Bruillov [...] a work in pen, executed by a member of the Academy of Arts [...] copies in oil paints of the portrait by Kiprenskii, made by Ge, Tropinin, and others. On the walls various views of places, that have a connection to Pushkin's life; the village which belonged to him *Mikhailovskoe* [...] On the walls of the next room hang portraits of persons, to whom Pushkin dedicated verses. [...] Here hangs the original portrait by Kiprenskii, owned by the son of the poet, and the portrait by Tropinin, owned by Prince Khilov.⁶⁹¹

Both *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* and *Venok na pamiatnik Pushkinu* agreed that the second room, the one that contained portraits, was the most interesting, and it was here that the original portraits by Tropinin and Kiprenskii were hung. The reports stress that these were the 'original' portraits, as copies of the Kiprenskii portrait – including the one by Ge which had toured in the fourth *Peredvizhniki* exhibition – were also included in the exhibition and the Tropinin portrait had the scandalous legend attached to its provenance, which of course *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* provided for readers. The story was recounted in even greater detail in the album of the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition (discussed further on) with the authenticity of the portrait being certified by Tropinin himself: 'the meeting of the artist with his work after many years was touching.'⁶⁹² In

⁶⁹¹ 'Otkrytie pamiatnika Pushkinu, v Moskve', *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 598, 21 June 1880, p. 506.

⁶⁹² *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, p. 100.

addition to the portraits by Tropinin and Kiprenskii and the designs for the Pushkin monument, there were a wide variety of visual representations of Pushkin, including *lubki* engravings, lithographs and photographs of oil paintings. However, the physical appearance of Pushkin seems to have been taken as already familiar to readers and the reviews did not go into great detail about how individual works represented him. *Sovremennye izvestiia* commented ‘...here is his youthful face (probably a reference to the Geitman engraving) with the established features (*ustanavlivaishchimisia chertami*) of his typical face’.⁶⁹³

The review in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* not only listed the works and items on display, it elaborated on them and demonstrates the Russian public’s growing interest in Pushkin’s personal life and his personal identity. Amongst the portraits on display of the poet’s family and friends the journal noted that:

One section of the wall is occupied with portraits of Pushkin’s relatives, from both his father’s and mother’s sides. The faces of the ancestors of the poet on his mother’s side, the Hannibals, attract special attention, the physiognomy of whom clearly points to his African origin.⁶⁹⁴

Pushkin’s African origins were fairly well known and the poet referred to them in his own poetry. Neither the 1880 nor the 1899 exhibition had any qualms about including portraits of Pushkin’s ancestors, including his African born great-grandfather Abram Petrovich Hannibal (1696-1781). Indeed, the album of the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition included a large portrait of A.P. Hannibal and discussed his origins at length. As J. Thomas Shaw notes, Pushkin’s African origins did not adversely effect his reception by the Russian public, in fact it was an important part of his personal identity. ‘To Russians, he is, paradoxically, the most “Russian” of authors, but at the same time [...] one who had African heritage and temperament.’⁶⁹⁵

It is worth pausing to examine the way in which the ‘items belonging to Pushkin’ were reported by *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, as this indicates the growth of Pushkin’s iconic, or celebrity, status which would in turn affect and be

⁶⁹³ Quoted in ‘Pushkinskaia vystavka’, p. 327.

⁶⁹⁴ ‘Otkrytie pamiatnika Pushkinu, v Moskve’, p. 506.

⁶⁹⁵ J. Thomas Shaw, ‘Pushkin on His African Heritage’, in *Puškin Today*, pp. 121-135, p. 135. On portraits of A.P. Hannibal see J.I. Edwards ‘Looking for Abram Hannibal’, *Slavonica*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2003, pp. 19-33.

affected by his visual representation. Items included in the exhibition were Pushkin's famous 'talisman' ring, which was afforded a brief history in which 'name dropping' other distinguished persons seems to be an important element. We learn that 'Princess Elizaveta Ksaverievna Vorontsova in Tiflis' had originally presented the ring to Pushkin and we then learn that Pushkin passed this gift onto his friend V.A. Zhukovskii, who in turn left it to his own son. 'Now this ring is in the possession of Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev and he has lent it to the exhibition.'⁶⁹⁶ Other minor personal effects were exhibited such as the poet's wallet and pieces of jewellery. Items such as a wallet cannot be seen to reflect Pushkin's talent or creativity in any way, they did not relate to his literary output; they drew interested viewers simply because they once belonged to Pushkin, and as *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* told its readership 'through them one can almost read the poet's whole life'.⁶⁹⁷ Although examples of Pushkin's literary output were on display in both Russian and foreign languages, it was the poet's personal life, especially dramatic moments and events from it, that now held the attention of the public. Pushkin's death seems to have had a particular attraction for many. Another review, this time in *Sovremennye izvestiia*, advised readers that:

In the exhibition the plaster mask deserves special attention, taken, as is known, from the likeness of the poet immediately after his death: the expression of the face imprinted with the mysterious stamp of death.⁶⁹⁸

Sharing in this morbid fascination, *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia* closed its exhibition review with the disappointing news that 'Pushkin's frockcoat, in which he was dressed at the time of his duel with d'Anthès, is not in the exhibition, since its present whereabouts are unknown.'⁶⁹⁹ It then provided a detailed history of what happened to the frockcoat immediately after the poet's death – it passed into the possession of M. P. Pogodin – but only a few days after Pogodin's own death in 1875 'someone stole it and no amount of effort by the relatives of Pushkin could help find the missing article.'⁷⁰⁰

⁶⁹⁶ Otkrytie pamiatnika Pushkinu, v Moskve', p. 507.

⁶⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁸ Quoted in 'Pushkinskaia vystavka', pp. 327-328.

⁶⁹⁹ 'Otkrytie pamiatnika Pushkinu, v Moskve' p. 507.

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid.

Whether the Moscow Exhibition was a success is a debatable matter. *Venok na pamiatnik Pushkinu* was published in order to commemorate the Pushkin Celebration and therefore declared that ‘overall, the exhibition attracted a great deal of interest, produced a solid impression and for all the days it was open had a marvellous number of visitors.’⁷⁰¹ It then quoted extensively from *Sovremennye izvestiia* which was also full of praise ‘Only two rooms...but how many jewels they contain for those who wish to cherish and study the memory of our great poet Pushkin! The exhibition is extraordinarily original in the smallest of details concerning the poet.’⁷⁰² However *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, though it found the contents of the exhibition to be interesting, questioned the organization of the event – ‘It should be noted that if the intended exhibition had been promoted to the public earlier, than in reality has been done, then of course it would have been far fuller.’⁷⁰³ Even if exhibition attendance was not what it might have been, the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition was another stage in the diversification of how Pushkin’s image was presented and received. Here, Pushkin’s portrait was no longer secondary to text, it was perceived to be more interesting than the text. As visual representations of the poet became more prolific, how they were presented to the public became a matter for discussion – whether it was in exhibitions or in books or on packaging.

The Society of Lovers of Russian Literature not only presented Pushkin at their exhibition, they also produced an album based on the event: *The Album of the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition (Al'bom Moskovskii Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda)*. This publication was not intended to accompany the exhibition, it was not a catalogue or *ukazatel'*, but rather an illustrated biography of the poet that included portraits that had been in the exhibition. The biography was written by A.A. Venkstern and interspersed amongst the text were sixty-five images, which were reproduced either as photogravures or photolithographs and had been produced by the Moscow photographer M.M. Panov. Of these, twelve were of Pushkin; individual portraits, group portraits or examples of the poet’s self-portrait caricature. They were placed in order to support Venstern’s narrative; therefore the Geitman portrait was first, followed by Ge’s picture, then

⁷⁰¹ ‘Pushkinskaia vystavka’, p. 326.

⁷⁰² Quoted in ‘Pushkinskaia vystavka’, p. 326.

⁷⁰³ ‘Otkrytie pamiatnika Pushkinu, v Moskve’, p. 506.

the portraits by Tropinin and Kiprenskii and other works such as a portrait by K. Briullov based upon the Kiprenskii portrait (Fig. 123). The aim of the album was to provide an illustrative chronology of Pushkin's life; so stated the editor in the preface to the second edition of the album: 'to propose an overview of the life of the poet in chronological order, the drawings arranged, corresponding to the text.'⁷⁰⁴ Therefore, no reproductions of the monument were included, but more significant elements were also missing from the album; no notes accompanied the illustrations that could provide details about the picture, artist, context, or whether the works were indeed included in the 1880 Pushkin Exhibition. This was one of the main points of contention raised by a review of the first edition of the album that appeared in *Russkaia starina*.⁷⁰⁵ In this review the album is subjected to constant criticism and very little praise. Such is the tone of the piece one has to wonder if there was not some personal grudge between the album's editor, L'v Polivanov, and the reviewer (initials Ia.U.).

The review addresses the illustrations and the biography separately, but begins by questioning the reasons behind the delay in the album's publication, the first edition of which appeared only in the autumn of 1882, 'of course, better late than never'.⁷⁰⁶ With reference to how Pushkin was presented, it was not the images selected that Ia.U. had problems with, but how they were reproduced. Ia.U. comments that the Geitman engraving shown in 'the album's photogravure is much weaker than (both) the original and a copy, reproduced by *Russkaia starina* in 1879.'⁷⁰⁷ However, the most damning judgement is reserved for a photogravure of a portrait purportedly executed by Karl Briullov in 1837. The original work is not outstanding, arguably a simplified variation of the Kiprenskii portrait. But its reproduction in the album is reported thus:

This is the worst photogravure in the entire album; the expression of the face is impossible, there is of course no shading, the left eye looks as if swollen and is quite poor, the mouth is crooked. It would be hard to imagine anything worse than this.⁷⁰⁸

⁷⁰⁴ *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda* (2nd ed.), p. V. The first edition of the album was only published in 1882. I have only been able to locate the 2nd edition, which was published in 1887 to coincide with the fiftieth anniversary of the poet's death.

⁷⁰⁵ Ia.U., 'Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda.' *Russkaia starina*, November 1883, pp. 457-476.

⁷⁰⁶ Ia.U., 'Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda', p. 457.

⁷⁰⁷ Ia.U., 'Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda', p. 458.

⁷⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 459.

In the second edition of the album the photogravure of the Briuollov portrait is not perfect and perhaps the left eye does look a little swollen, but it would not seem to merit the criticism given above and so it is probable that the images were revised and improved. Certainly, some of the album was altered, as the 1882 edition contained a 'supplement' that is absent from the 1887 edition. Perhaps the opinion of *Russkaia starina* concerning this 'supplement' sealed its fate:

We have examined the artistic and literary parts of the album, but still there is a 'supplement' in it. What is this? Perhaps this is an interesting extract from the poet's manuscripts, perhaps a detailed list of his papers or an inventory of the album's portraits? No, it is only a Latin translation of three verses by Pushkin about the Poet, done by a professor of Moscow University, Mr Korsh. We believe that the learned professor has done an excellent translation of these verses, but we absolutely do not understand the reason why this translation has appeared in the album of the Pushkin exhibition, the editor does not explain this and what is more probably cannot do so satisfactorily.⁷⁰⁹

According to the preface in the second edition of the album, the first edition, which *Russkaia starina* so criticized, 'sold out extraordinarily quickly and since then there has been no end of statements, wishing that the album was published again.'⁷¹⁰ We can conclude that the album must have had some kind of commercial success for it to be republished again in 1887 and it shows the public's growing appetite for all things 'Pushkin' particularly visual representations. The 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition and album may have not been a complete success, but they provided a foundation for those exhibitions and albums staged and produced in 1899.

Exhibitions in 1899

As with all aspects of the 1899 Pushkin Jubilee the exhibitions staged in this year were larger and more diverse than in 1880. In Moscow, the Society of Lovers of Russian Literature staged another exhibition, this time in five halls of the History Museum, from the 29 May to the 13 June. The Moscow Public and Rumiantsov Museum also held a Pushkin exhibition, which comprised of manuscripts, books and albums associated with Pushkin, members of his family or friends. Although it did not exhibit any painted portraits of the poet,

⁷⁰⁹ Ia.U. 'Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda', pp. 475-476.

⁷¹⁰ *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, p. V.

publications which featured printed portraits, including journals such as *Budil'nik* were on show, as were *lubki* based around Pushkin's fairy tales and characters, such as the *Tale of the Tsar Sultan* and the Ukrainian Hetman Mazepa from the epic poem *Poltava*.⁷¹¹ The album of the 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition was also included as an exhibit. This in itself demonstrates the growing celebrity status of the poet; not only are materials that were produced by Pushkin or contemporary to him viewed as worthy of exhibition, there is a demand for anything associated with him or about him. At this exhibition the focus for once was on Pushkin's literature rather than his personal life. Nevertheless, the preface to the *ukazatel'* uses the most exalted language to describe the museum's Pushkin collection and the exhibition reflects Pushkin's iconic status in 1899.

For the momentous days of the centenary of the birth of A.S. Pushkin the Moscow Public and Rumiantsov Museum has placed on view the treasure exclusive to its department of manuscripts and library. In the Museum's department of manuscripts are kept those works in the poet's own hand inherited his family [...] With reverence preserving the treasures entrusted to it, the Museum sees it as its duty to preserve them in the same condition in which they entered the Museum.⁷¹²

As well as the event at the Rumiantsov Museum, a small exhibition was held at the Moscow 5th Male Gymnasium (although not until October 1899) that included a number of images such as photographs of the Kiprenskii and Tropinin portraits and copies of the best known works including the Geitman and Wright engravings. There were also sixteen 'sculptural images' of the poet on display and views of places where Pushkin lived and scenes from his life. These included copies of the Ge picture of Pushkin and Pushchin, and three Aivazovskii paintings showing Pushkin by the sea.⁷¹³ Pushkin exhibitions were also staged in the main provincial cities including Odessa and Astrakhan⁷¹⁴ but the two principal ones were the Society for Lovers of Russian Literature's Moscow exhibition and the 'official' Jubilee exhibition held in the Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg. Continuing the tradition established by the 1880

⁷¹¹ *Moskovskii publichnyi i Rumiantsovskii Muzei. Pushkinskaia vystavka 1899 g. Ukazatel'* Moscow, 1899, pp. 31-32.

⁷¹² *Ibid.*, p. 1.

⁷¹³ *Katalog Pushkinskoi vystavki v Moskovskoi 5 gimnazii v oktiabre 1899*. Moscow, 1899

⁷¹⁴ See *Katalog Pushkinskoi vystavki v Odesse*, Odessa, 1899 and *Katalog knig, graviur i raznykh predmetov, predstavlenykh na Pushkinskuiu vystavku v g. Astrakhan*, Astrakhan, 1899.

Moscow exhibition these two exhibitions also produced albums, although they were published in the year the exhibition took place, priced at seven and six roubles respectively.⁷¹⁵ Both exhibitions were bigger than that staged in 1880, and undoubtedly there was competition between the event in Moscow and the 'official' one. The involvement of the tsarist authorities in the centenary celebrations has been noted, but nowhere was it more visually apparent than in the album of the 1899 St. Petersburg Exhibition. The first portraits the reader came across were not of Pushkin, nor even his family, but those of tsars Aleksandr I and Nicholas I and their respective wives.

The St. Petersburg exhibition aimed to include as many portraits of Pushkin it could possibly find. It was organized into five sections: manuscripts; journals; works published by Pushkin; almanacs, albums and collections; and portraits and pictures. The latter section was by far the largest and the catalogue lists five hundred and fifty-nine items in this section alone, although also included were items belonging to, or associated with the poet, for example a lock of his hair!⁷¹⁶ Of course, not all the portraits on show were of Pushkin, many were of his friends and family as had been the case in the 1880 Moscow exhibition, yet over fifty portraits of the poet were on display; a photograph that appeared in *Niva* of one of the exhibition walls (Fig. 124) gives an impression of the bombardment of Pushkin portraits visitors would have experienced.⁷¹⁷ The exhibition included a variety of pictures and portraits including Dmitriev-Kavkazskii's engraving and self-portraits by Pushkin, but most of the portraits were variations of the Pushkin represented in the Kiprenskii/Utkin portraits. The exhibition catalogue lists thirteen portraits that were reproductions of either of these two works and in addition there were other portraits based upon them. Although this exhibition did contain books and other printed materials, the focus was on the portraits, as one newspaper review of the event explained. The review also implied that once again the event could have been better promoted to the public.

⁷¹⁵ *Al'bom Pushkinskoi vystavki ustroennoi Obshchestvom liubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti v zalakh Istoricheskogo muzeia v Moskve 29 maia-13 iunia 1899*, Moscow, 1899. L.N. Maikov & B.L. Modzalevskii (eds.), *Al'bom Pushkinskoi iubileinoi vystavki v Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk v S-Peterburge. Mai 1899*, Moscow, 1899.

⁷¹⁶ *Pushkinskaia iubileinaia vystavka v imperatorskoi Akademii nauk v Peterburge. Katalog*, St. Petersburg, 1899, no. 731.

⁷¹⁷ *Niva*, no. 25, 1899, p. 473.

On the 15 or 16 May in the large Conference Hall of the Imperial Academy of Sciences will open the Pushkin Exhibition comprising a whole series of objects, that are related in some way or other to the poet's memory. The exhibition, it can be said, has been created surreptitiously. Up until now little has been heard about it and nothing written. It is the work of the academician L.N. Maikov, who has invested no little effort and energy into researching and collecting all kinds of rare items connected with the poet's name. Since the main aim of the exhibition is to present a picture never before seen of that era in which Pushkin happened to live, the first place in both number and variety will be occupied by portraits of the poet, his colleagues, friends, society figures of the time, critics, writers, etc. and very little space will be given over to various publications of the poet's collected works, manuscripts and similar items that might be of more interest to scholars rather than the public. Items collected for the exhibition, can be divided in five groups, the largest group, as already said, consists of all sorts of portraits, which number more than three hundred. Here there are portraits, painted in oil paints, watercolours, pencil, polytype, engravings, lithographs, etc. Of portraits of Pushkin, there will be few exhibited: these are the portrait by Tropinin, the famous portraitist of that time, in which Pushkin is represented with the Talisman – with the ring on the thumb of his right hand, which A.S. always carried, sealed on his letters and he believed in its miraculous strength.⁷¹⁸

This small piece highlights the important role of visual culture in the 1899 Jubilee. Books and manuscripts – things of interest to the scholar – will not dominate the exhibition, instead portraits – things of interest to the public – will comprise most of the contents. The album of this exhibition also reflected the dominance of the visual; instead of illustrations supporting the text it was the reverse, with the majority of the volume taken up with pictures (two hundred and fifty phototypes) accompanied by a written inventory.

The main 1899 Moscow exhibition, organized by Society for Lovers of Russian Literature, similarly focused on visual, rather than literary items. A correspondent for *Peterburgskaia gazeta* reiterated the point:

The main place in this exhibition is taken by portraits of Pushkin, his family and contemporaries. Here will be collected the best portraits, painted of him by the artists Mazer, Tropinin and Kiprenskii, the latter given by the son of the poet A.A. Pushkin, and the former – M.N. Kuznetsov, the Tropinin portrait – from the collection of Princess Khilkova...the monument of Pushkin on Tverskoi Boulevard, has been enclosed by fencing and preparation by night has been started for the flower planting and decoration.⁷¹⁹

⁷¹⁸ 'Pushkinskaia vystavka', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, no. 127, 11 May 1899, p. 2.

⁷¹⁹ 'K Pushkinskim torzhestvam', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, no. 125, 9 May 1899, p. 4.

It seems that both the Moscow and St. Petersburg exhibitions could have included the original portraits by Kiprenskii and Tropinin as the Petersburg exhibition ran from 16-26 May and the Moscow one from 29 May-13 June. Like the album of the 1899 Petersburg exhibition, the Moscow album had altered from the 1880 version, and the emphasis was on the pictures, not biography. As it stated in its brief preface: 'The main interest in the Pushkin Exhibition lies in the representation of Pushkin himself. [...] The Society succeeded in collecting in its exhibition originals of the best and most interesting portraits of the poet. In the present album are given pictures taken from originals by Kiprenskii, Tropinin, Briullov and Mazer. (oil paintings) Sokolov (watercolour) and Wright (Sepia).'⁷²⁰ The Moscow album consisted of eighty-six pages of illustrations and these were presented in rough chronological order; the Geitman engraving was first followed by the Tropinin and Kiprenskii portraits, then some other lesser known portraits and then the Wright engraving and also a reproduction of Opekushin's monument. Following on from portraits of Pushkin were those of his contemporaries, in fact these took up more space than portraits of Pushkin. This album also included a full inventory of the exhibition's contents and once again, one is struck by the repeated appearance of variations of the same portrait. For example, there were eight examples from different sources of the Geitman engraving and although the exhibition did not include the original Ge picture of Pushkin and Pushchin, it did include one painted copy of it and two prints of it. However, most portraits were based on the Kiprenskii/Utkin portraits. From the details supplied in the inventory it is possible to calculate that fifty-five of the portraits on display were versions of these two works. One of the illustrations in the album gives a good impression of this. Fig. 113 shows ten small portraits of Pushkin and of these, nine derive from the Kiprenskii/Utkin portraits.⁷²¹

The 1899 Pushkin exhibitions not only reflect the advancements that took place in exhibition culture from 1880 to 1899, they also demonstrated the Russian public's growing fascination with Pushkin and aspects from his

⁷²⁰ *Al'bom Pushkinskoi vystavki ustroennoi Obshchestvom liubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti v zalakh Istoricheskogo muzeia v Moskve 29 maia-13 iunia 1899*, n.p.

⁷²¹ In the inventory it describes these portraits as 'Lithographed portraits of Pushkin made after his death in 1837. The majority of which are taken from the Kiprenskii (from Utkin). One is from the Tropinin.' *Al'bom Pushkinskoi vystavki ustroennoi Obshchestvom liubitelei rossiiskoi slovesnosti v zalakh Istoricheskogo muzeia v Moskve 29 maia-13 iunia 1899*, p. 2.

personal life. Pushkin's literary output as a writer was acknowledged by the exhibitions, but one feels that the organizers realized that the public would rather look at a lock of the poet's hair, or his death mask, than a French translation of one of his poems. The repeated appearance in both of the main 1899 exhibitions of the Kiprenskii/Utkin portraits show that this representation of Pushkin had established itself as *the* representation of Pushkin in the Russian public consciousness.

The 1899 Pushkin exhibitions were only some of many events staged in 1899 to celebrate the birth of the poet. Other activities included in the Tauride Palace on 27 May, 'a Celebratory Artistic Procession, numbering up to five hundred persons, as groups, portraying the works of Pushkin. In the Theatrical Hall: Apotheosis, *tableaux vivants* of Pushkin types and a statue of Pushkin. Concluding in the Garden, by the lake, Pushkin themed fireworks.'⁷²² These all contributed to the overwhelming visual nature of the 1899 Jubilee but one element of the centenary that the authorities or various organizations and societies seemed to have little control over was the use by manufacturers and advertising agencies of Pushkin's portrait to promote their products.

Promotional Pushkin

Did Pushkin ever think that someday his image would be employed as an advert for ...selling special national vodka? Hardly. Fully convinced that through his work he created himself 'a monument not built by human hands' to which 'The path of the people to it will never grow over' the poet probably did not dream about such peculiar popularity.⁷²³

One of the most insightful images to emerge from the 1899 Pushkin Jubilee appeared on the front cover of a commemorative supplement to *Peterburgskaia gazeta* (Fig. 125).⁷²⁴ A simple line drawing, it shows the monument to Pushkin surrounded by merchants and tradesmen. One man holds aloft a box of 'Pushkin chocolates' and another a bar of 'Pushkin soap'. Underneath this illustration are printed two lines: 'to the Pushkin Celebration' and below that, 'in "honour" of Pushkin.'⁷²⁵ *Peterburgskaia gazeta* was making a visual critique of the use by confectioners and perfumeries of Pushkin's image in order to promote their

⁷²² Events programme, *Pushkinskii Prazdnik v zalakh i sadu Tavricheskago Dvortsa*, St. Petersburg, 1899.

⁷²³ Libroich, *Pushkin*, p. 242.

⁷²⁴ Collection ARPM.

products; rather hypocritical as in the spring of 1899 this popular paper regularly carried adverts for *Pushkinskie papirosy* and similar 'Pushkin' items.

The use of Pushkin's image in advertising and packaging in 1899 is a topic that has been neglected by scholars, except for a short article by Maria Kublitskaia, based on the collection of the ARPM.⁷²⁶ Levitt, in his study of 1899, concentrates on literary politics and the intelligentsia's rejection of the Pushkin Jubilee as 'trashy, artificial, and false'.⁷²⁷ Levitt seems to share the symbolist poets' distaste for the commercial use of Pushkin's image, what Levitt terms 'the political vulgarisation and manipulation of the poet's image.'⁷²⁸ I would agree that the Pushkin board game: 'Pushkin's Duel' was in bad taste, but the wholesale rejection of commercial items that featured Pushkin's visual representation is, I believe, a mistake. For through the examination of these items we can determine the visual representation of Pushkin to which the large majority of the urban Russian population was exposed, which was far more than would read D.S. Merezhkovskii's attack on such items in the art journal *Mir iskusstva*.⁷²⁹

Businessmen and merchants realised the commercial potential of Pushkin around the time of the 1880 Celebration. In the last chapter of his book Librovich considered the existence of items such as a vodka bottle shaped to resemble the head of Pushkin (Fig. 126),⁷³⁰ Pushkin's portrait on chocolate wrappers and cigarette cartons, on note paper and other items. Librovich takes a balanced and humorous approach to this subject and considers the individual merits of each use of Pushkin. For example, with reference to the first Pushkin-shaped vodka bottles he comments:

⁷²⁵ Collection ARPM.

⁷²⁶ Kublitskaia, 'Tepericha Pushkin v mode...', *Doma u Pushkina*, special edition of *Ars Peterburg, Rossiiskii zhurnal iskusstv*, St. Petersburg, 1994, pp. 91-95. The commercial use of Pushkin from 1880-1999 is also discussed in N.I. Mikhailova, 'Shokolad russkikh poetov – Pushkin', in M.N. Virolainen (ed.), *Legendy i mify o Pushkine*, St. Petersburg, 1994, pp. 282-287.

⁷²⁷ Levitt, 'Pushkin in 1899', p. 192.

⁷²⁸ Ibid.

⁷²⁹ Dmitrii Sergeevich Merezhkovskii (1866-1941) was one of the founding members of the Symbolist literary movement in Russia. In 1899 he published 'Prazdnik Pushkina', in *Mir iskusstva*, no. 13-14, May 1899, pp. 11-24 in which he criticized the commercialisation of Pushkin's image. Levitt considers this edition of *Mir iskusstva* to be 'the most outspoken rejection of the Pushkin Centennial'. Levitt, 'Pushkin in 1899', p. 193.

⁷³⁰ Collection ARPM.

the existence of a special type of glass bottle, the exterior of which represents him... neither more, nor less, than a fairly exact image of Pushkin's head with his typical 'African features' prominent cheekbones and curly hair. Not many have attained such strange popularity, I know not of a Shakespeare,⁷³¹ nor Goethe, nor Moliere, [...] indeed the original 'Pushkinskaia' bottle represents a contemporary original invention.⁷³²

Although Librovich found this bottle acceptable, its popularity led to other factories across the Russian Empire producing versions of lesser quality and in these, 'which one now meets for sale, the image of Pushkin is dreadful.'⁷³³ Even Librovich, writing in 1889, could not believe the various places Pushkin's portrait was now appearing: 'In general, with regards to Pushkin advertisements of late, especially since 1880, people take liberties and one encounters the image of the poet more and more on all possible items and even, in some respects, on impossible ones.'⁷³⁴ This situation would reach a peak in 1899 when the 'all possible and impossible' items included Pushkin's portrait on a penknife (Fig. 127), a metal clock face (Fig. 128) and a handkerchief (Fig. 129) - items that could be dismissed as Pushkin 'kitsch'.⁷³⁵ I believe however, that Pushkin kitsch

⁷³¹ There may not have been Shakespeare vodka (or beer) bottles, but during the 1864 Shakespeare tercentenary numerous items of Shakespeare kitsch were on sale. The 1864 Shakespeare tercentenary jubilee saw items for sale such as Goodall's 'Shakespeare Tercentenary Playing Cards' and Rimmel's 'The Bard of Avon's Perfume', 'The Shakespeare Sachet' and 'The Shakespeare Souvenir'. 'The 2 latter are pretty scent packets, with portraits of Shakespeare and choice quotations from his works.' Advertisements from back cover of the *Official Programme of the Various Performances arranged to be given in connection with the London Shakespeare Tercentenary Festival*, published Adam & Francis, London, 1864. Porcelain figurines of British writers were also produced in the nineteenth century. Robert Burns, Sir Walter Scott, Byron, as well as Shakespeare, were amongst those modelled. See P.D.G. Pugh, *Staffordshire Portrait Figures of the Victorian Era*, Woodbridge, 1998.

⁷³² Librovich, *Pushkin*, p. 242.

⁷³³ Ibid.

⁷³⁴ Ibid.

⁷³⁵ All collection ARPM. In his study of the 1887 jubilee of Queen Victoria Thomas Richards noted that 'most definitions of kitsch see it as an utterly unsuccessful form of representation.' T. Richards, *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England. Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914*, Stanford, 1990, p. 90. *Kitsch* is a difficult term to define and its definitions usually have negative connotations. For example, Jean Baudrillard comments: 'The kitsch object is commonly understood as one of that great army of "trashy" objects, made of plaster of Paris or some such imitation material... To the aesthetics of beauty and originality, kitsch opposes its *aesthetics of simulation*: it everywhere reproduces objects smaller and larger than life; it imitates materials... it apes forms or combines them discordantly...' *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*, London, 1998, p. 109-111. Richards however views kitsch as 'an outmoded rather than inadequate form of representation.' *The Commodity Culture*, p. 90. This thesis takes on board Richards' conclusions and does not view kitsch as a trivial or inadequate means of representation. 'In the 1860s and 1870s kitsch began as a simple descriptive term for the products of a fully modern mode of commodity manufacture... Far from being trivial things, the varieties of kitsch constructed a complex representation of the material spaces which the nineteenth-century bourgeoisie charged with a heavy burden of significance.' p. 91. Rather,

is an important source for understanding the position of Pushkin, and some other writers, in Russian society at the end of the nineteenth century. The use of Pushkin in advertising was part of a wider trend in late imperial Russian commerce that saw national symbols, particularly those from Russia's past, used to promote a vast array of products. As Sally West observes, Russia's past offered firms the ideal means by which to attract customers in the present:

In the constant quest for a resonant message, advertisers spoke to the Russian public as much through the retrospective idiom of cultural heritage as through the forward-looking parlance of modern life. They appropriated national symbols and imitated popular and elite literature; they embraced religious holidays and invoked patriotic pride in historical events and the arts, Russian landmarks and national characteristics.⁷³⁶

Pushkin was a most significant figure in Russia's cultural and literary heritage and one who in addition, as this thesis has shown, already had a well established visual heritage. It is important to remember that the commercial use of Pushkin did not emerge out of nowhere and was partly a result of the increasing presence of the poet in Russian visual culture since the 1870s. The contents of the 1899 Pushkin exhibitions demonstrated that the overwhelming number of portraits of Pushkin derived from the representation of the poet defined by the Kiprenskii/Utkin portrait. This particular representation of Pushkin and the iconography it established also dominated the depictions of the poet on commercial items in the 1890s. The Kiprenskii/Utkin Pushkin was ideal for commercial use for a number of reasons. Firstly, manufacturers could be confident that the majority of the public would be able to identify this image as Pushkin due to the iconography of hair, whiskers and bow tie, however crude the reproduction. Fig. 130 shows a small newspaper advert for a Pushkin clock⁷³⁷ and even though the quality of the paper and printing is poor, it can still be identified as Pushkin. Secondly, the Kiprenskii portrait presents us with a Romantic and youthful representation of the poet, a representation of a man that Russians would be proud to have as their national writer; there are no Pushkins on packets or wrappers who have 'ugly exteriors'. However, Pushkin, unlike any other writer before him, could represent two somewhat conflicting messages to

items of kitsch provide vital evidence for understanding how visual culture operated at a period when it was expanding and developing at an unprecedented rapid pace.

⁷³⁶ West, *Constructing Consumer Culture*, p. 190.

the consumer. He could be associated both with national achievement and individual spirit. His placement on a product could be both a symbol of its national greatness and its individual quality. This section will now examine a selection of depictions of Pushkin placed on commercial items in 1899 and how they represented Pushkin's personal, professional and national identities, sometimes visually manipulating all three to great effect.

In the collection of the All-Russian Pushkin Museum the majority of commercial items from 1899 are related either to confectionery, cigarettes or toiletries. As West has shown in her study of advertising in late imperial Russia, these were three industries that paid great attention to the promotion and advertisement of their products. Confectionery and toiletries can both be considered 'luxury' items, although there were of course different types of chocolates and sweets, some aimed at adults and some at children.⁷³⁸ With reference to Pushkin's appearance on confectionery packaging, the standard of the product was reflected in the standard of the image produced, but not the image itself. For example Figs. 131 and 132⁷³⁹ are two lids from boxes of expensive looking chocolates, produced by the firms I.L. Dingz and M. Konradi. Both Pushkins presented on the lids are clearly based on the Kiprenskii portrait and the image used by Konradi is of an especially high standard. The Dingz image of Pushkin seems to have somewhat softened the poet's features and feminised him; the process of chromolithography has reddened his cheeks and lips. Nevertheless, both images include all the key elements of the Pushkin iconography and also include the drape of tartan from the Kiprenskii portrait. At the other end of the scale, individual caramel wrappers (Fig. 133)⁷⁴⁰ produced by a variety of firms are of a far lower standard of quality and this is reflected in the standard of the image reproduction but not in the image they have chosen to use.

⁷³⁷ Collection ARPM.

⁷³⁸ Manufacturers devised marketing strategies aimed at children and their parents. S. Vasil'ev published the 'Shokoladnaia biblioteka' - a series of miniature editions that accompanied boxes of the firm's chocolates. On the back cover of books Pushkin's portrait was placed in the centre accompanied by Nekrasov, Tolstoi and Turgenev. The firm issued a lengthy preface in all its books in which it claimed that chocolate and literature were a natural partnership 'chocolate is both a delicacy and a strong sustenance; it is nourishing and wholesome especially for children and books also nourish and stimulate the mind'. However, it also stated that the nature of 'this venture is essentially a commercial one'. Preface to *Shokoladnaia biblioteka: Stikhotvoreniia A.S. Pushkina*, published by the confectionery factory S. Vasil'ev, St. Petersburg, 1895.

⁷³⁹ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁴⁰ Collection ARPM.

As with the luxury chocolates, they used a Kiprenskii-derived representation of Pushkin, although perhaps less because of the romantic image of the poet it conveyed and more to do with the fact that this was the Pushkin iconography familiar to so many. The use of a simple head and shoulders portrait of Pushkin was the most common form of representation of the poet, particularly on smaller items such as cigarette cartons. The sale of Pushkin cigarettes and other items was reported in the pages of *Peterburgskaia gazeta* at the beginning of May 1899.

In the windows of some tobacconists and small shops appeared the other day boxes of *papirosy* with portraits of A.S. Pushkin. On the occasion of the Jubilee day according to the words of the tobacco shop proprietors, there will be released so called 'Jubilee Pushkin *papirosy*' in special packets with a portrait of the poet on the outside and inside of the box, together with the *papirosy* will be enclosed with the permission of the excise inspectorate a small booklet with poems of Pushkin. Such surprises have also been prepared for the Pushkin Jubilee by a few confectionery manufactories, who have placed large orders for boxes, bags, baskets with portraits of Pushkin.⁷⁴¹

Fig. 134⁷⁴² is a packet of cigarettes produced by A.N. Shaposhinkov that although small, offered the purchaser a good quality black and white portrait of the poet. However, most cigarette companies used bolder colours and designs in order to catch the attention of smokers. Figs. 135 and 136⁷⁴³ are two large advertising placards promoting *papirosy* made by the firms Bros. Aslandi and N.K. Popov. Both are brightly coloured and prominently feature a Pushkin portrait; both frame the poet with laudatory laurels; in addition the Popov advertisement includes a reference to Pushkin's profession, a lyre and a roll of manuscript. This exact image was repeated on cartons of Popov's cigarettes (Fig. 137)⁷⁴⁴ and the inclusion of a manuscript as a visual reference to Pushkin's professional identity was also employed more explicitly by the firm Bros. Shapshal, whose cigarette carton featured a quill and manuscript as well as making an implicit reference to Pushkin's national identity by placing the portrait in a 'Russian Style' frame (Fig. 138).⁷⁴⁵ The Kiprenskii/Utkin derived

⁷⁴¹ 'K Pushkinskim tozhestvam', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, no. 122, 6 May 1899, p. 3.

⁷⁴² Collection ARPM.

⁷⁴³ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁴⁴ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁴⁵ Collection ARPM.

portrait framed by laurels and/or a lyre and manuscript, was one of the most frequently reproduced images on packaging. As well as cigarette cartons it appeared on confectionery. Fig. 139⁷⁴⁶ is the lid from a box of 'Pushkin caramels' produced by Bligken and Robinson of St. Petersburg. It demonstrates a most impressive use of the Kiprenskii/Utkin portrait, whilst the sepia tones are reminiscent of the Wright engraving. N.L. Shustov and Sons of Moscow also placed a similar design on their bottle of 'Jubilee Liqueur' (Fig. 140).⁷⁴⁷

The toiletries firm A.M. Ostroumov created a rather picturesque design for their 'A.S. Pushkin soap' (Fig. 141)⁷⁴⁸ by placing miniature laurels and harps in between a portrait of the poet and an image of the Opekushin monument. This subtle, classical device was not the only means employed as a visual reference to the poet's profession. Some more imaginative packaging designs combined images of Pushkin with characters from his poems, and in particular his retelling of Russian fairy tales (*skazki*). Fig. 142⁷⁴⁹ is a box of chocolates manufactured by Abrikosov and Sons. In the left hand corner is the familiar Pushkin portrait, but the majority of the lid is taken up with a scene from *The Golden Fish*. S.Vasilev's 'Pushkin caramels' may not have had the colour of the Abrikosov design, but it compensated with its content (Fig. 143).⁷⁵⁰ Pushkin is placed in the centre of the design surrounded by his characters – *bogatyr*s from *Ruslan and Liudmilla*, a Cossack horseman from *Poltava* and Evgenii Onegin all vie for attention. V. Shuvalov's box of sweets and caramels (Fig. 144)⁷⁵¹ provides one of the most eye catching designs; in terms of colour and motifs. On the front of the box is the standard Pushkin portrait but to the right of the poet is a most imaginative depiction of the scene 'Tatiana's dream' from *Evgenii Onegin*. On the back of the box is a scene from *Ruslan and Liudmilla* with the epic *bogatyr*s; on the side panels of the box more illustrations based on *skazki* and a picture of the Opekushin monument! This combination of characters and representations of the poet was also featured on a Pushkin handkerchief, an item for decorative, rather than practical use one imagines, produced by the Moscow toiletries firm Brocard.

⁷⁴⁶ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁴⁷ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁴⁸ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁴⁹ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁵⁰ Collection ARPM.

On the use of Russian literature in advertising, West argues that it was a direct ploy by companies to attract educated customers. She refers to Ostroumov's line of perfume and soaps called 'Belle Tatiana' that depicted scenes from *Evgenii Onegin* on the packaging and states 'only the educated would realize [it was] in honour of the centennial of Pushkin's birth'.⁷⁵² This may have been the case with reference to a specific Pushkin work or character, but Pushkin himself would have been a familiar figure to all St. Petersburg citizens, even if they had not read his poetry. By 1899 Pushkin was famous simply for being Pushkin, as this sketch from *Budil'nik* demonstrates:

- Look, even fashionable dandies smoke *Pushkinskie papirosy*.
- Do they really know who Pushkin was?
- Let us assume that they do not know about Pushkin, but does it matter as long as they smoke 'Pushkin' ?⁷⁵³

West does point out that the Russian *skazki* were a literary genre 'accessible to all native Russians',⁷⁵⁴ and it seems that characters from these were the most frequently depicted of all Pushkin's literary creations - they could appeal to all ages and social groups. As well as appearing on chocolate boxes and handkerchiefs, Pushkin and his characters appeared on home wares. Figs. 145 to 147⁷⁵⁵ show the sides of a commemorative porcelain beaker manufactured by M.S. Kuzentsov in 1899. The design includes a portrait of Pushkin, in this case with rather bouffant hair, a dedicative scroll and the mythical *bogatyrs* from *Ruslan and Liudmilla*.

Not only did the characters from the Russian fairy tales have universal appeal, they also offered a national element to these designs in which the representation of Pushkin, in accordance with the Kiprenskii portrait, was as a fashionable European, rather than Russian. Tropinin's portrait occasionally appeared on confectionery wrappers and on calendars but rarely elsewhere. The *bogatyrs* were the most explicit way in which Pushkin's national identity was implied. The other means was to frame the poet not with laurels, but with motifs and patterns associated with medieval Russian designs and folk art. Earlier we

⁷⁵¹ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁵² West, *Constructing Consumer Culture*, p. 212.

⁷⁵³ *Budil'nik*, 23 May 1899, quoted in Kublitskaia, 'Tepericha Pushkin v mode...', p. 92.

⁷⁵⁴ West, *Constructing Consumer Culture*, p. 215

saw how the photographer Shapiro had set his portraits of contemporary writers in a Russian style frame and a similar process of visual ‘Russification’ is evident in a variety of Pushkin commercial items. Figs. 148 to 150⁷⁵⁶ are a tin tray, the cardboard backing to a calendar and a cheap packet of cigarettes manufactured in Kiev; all in some way try to incorporate traditional or folk Russian design motifs into their representation of Pushkin. The clearest example of this is the calendar which attempts to resemble a traditional Russian embroidered towel or wall hanging onto which Pushkin’s portrait is placed. This was actually a fairly sophisticated design as the laurels surrounding the portrait were raised. The tin tray recalls the patterns of ancient or medieval Russia and the use of gold and reds gives it an opulent feel, perhaps attempting to replicate in affordable form, some platter from a Kremlin service. The design of the cigarette carton manufactured by N.A. Pilipenko in Kiev has none of the colour or allegorical motifs of the Moscow or St. Petersburg cigarette cartons, and its portrait of Pushkin is fairly crude. However, the Kiev firm have perhaps tried to reflect some of their own city’s history as well as Pushkin’s national identity, and placed a row, either side of the poet, of simple decoration that recalls designs used in ancient Rus’.

As well as the satirical sketches of *Strekoza* and *Budil’nik* that mocked the enthusiasm of the public for all things ‘Pushkin’, *Peterburgskaia gazeta* also reported on some of the stranger visual representations of Pushkin to be found in the Jubilee year. The most extreme example I encountered is worth detailing as its existence makes items such as the Pushkin pen nib seem tame by comparison. On the 21 May *Peterburgskaia gazeta* placed the following report:

All sorts of people are now taking an interest in images of Pushkin! Just imagine; even hairdressers have conceived the wish to show off their art in connection with the image of the great poet. In the window of one of our barbers the bust of the great poet, fashioned from wax, has been exhibited. The bust of the poet is distinguished by its likeness to him (this has been attained by the hairdresser with relation to the ‘growth’ of a black hair wig and sideburns which have been made highly *life-like*) but really, *life’s* coming to something when hairdressers advertise themselves at the expense of a genius poet!⁷⁵⁷

⁷⁵⁵ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁵⁶ Collection ARPM.

⁷⁵⁷ ‘Al’bom’, *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, 21 May, 1899, p. 2.

One can perhaps understand why D.S. Merezhkovskii, who believed Pushkin represented all that was best and most noble in Russia culture, was so incensed by the treatment of his beloved poet in the Jubilee year. He summed up the events of 1899 as ‘there is really something insane here, funny and at the same time horrible – and the funnier the more horrible.’⁷⁵⁸ Indeed, perhaps there is something both funny and horrible about a crude wax model of Pushkin in the window of a barber’s shop, but this is an extreme example and Merezhkovskii was angry about the general appropriation of Pushkin. ‘Is it not insulting that the great name is becoming the property of the crowd, which as before has nothing in common at all with the one who bore it? [...] What is he to them? Why do they need Pushkin?’⁷⁵⁹ Merezhkovskii failed to see that the phenomenon of the writer becoming the property of the crowd was not unique to Pushkin, although he was the most extreme example, but had been slowly evolving for the last thirty years. The existence of Pushkin chocolates, soaps and cigarettes should not be seen as vulgarising the writer’s reputation, but rather one of the natural outcomes in a modern society which places the profession of writer in such a celebrated position. Pushkin was more suited than most Russian writers for advertisements; by 1899 his visual heritage had already established him as a well-dressed young man in the Russian public consciousness and the dramatic episodes from his life were widely known. In 1899 commercial representations of the poet fused together his personal and professional identities, often in highly imaginative and decorative forms. These representations were both commented on in the press, and received by the public through their purchase of Pushkin items. The commercial representations of Pushkin were not examples of ‘Fine Art’ - although they were descended from the portraits of Kiprenskii, Utkin and Wright – but they were one of the principal means through which the writer remained one of the most recognized figures in Russian visual culture. Although William Stead, one of the pioneers of advertising in England, made the following comment in 1899 in relation to the role of advertising in this country, his opinion is equally valid in relation to Russia and the appropriation of Pushkin by Russian manufacturers:

⁷⁵⁸ D.S. Merezhkovskii quoted in Levitt, ‘Pushkin in 1899’, p. 195.

⁷⁵⁹ Ibid.

The Advertiser is the artistic teacher of the English People of today. The merchant who calls attention to his goods by means of gigantic pictorials has probably done more to develop the latent appreciation of art in the British people than the artists of all lands and all times put together [...] The artistic education of the great mass of English men and women is picked up from the poster on the wall, and the advertisement in the paper or magazine.⁷⁶⁰

⁷⁶⁰ W. Stead, *The Art of Advertising. Its Theory and Practise Fully Described*, London, 1899, p. 95.

Conclusion

This thesis ends its study in 1899, a year that marked not only the centenary of A.S. Pushkin, but also the first edition of the *Mir iskusstva* journal. As was noted in the previous section, *Mir iskusstva* published D.S. Merezhkovskii's damning condemnation on the appropriation of Pushkin in 1899 and a new generation of Russian writers, the Symbolists, tried to wrest Pushkin from the hands of the tsarist authorities and popular consumerism. However, although the Symbolists may have campaigned for a more scholarly approach to Pushkin, his image was now firmly established in popular Russian visual culture, along with that of Tolstoi and to a lesser extent Dostoevskii, Nekrasov, and other writers from the second half of the nineteenth century. Literate Russians may not have been familiar with all the aforementioned writers' works, but they would undoubtedly be familiar with what the authors looked like. Writers continue to have commercial appeal in Russia today. Although contemporary writers may no longer appear on the front cover of cheap weekly magazines - their position as 'celebrities' in Russian society usurped by actors, pop stars and models - the Tret'iakov Gallery continues to sell reproductions of *Peredvizhniki* portraits as posters and there is also a series of bookmarks entitled 'Portraits of writers', amongst them Perov's Ostrovskii and Dostoevskii, Kramskoi's Tolstoi and Kiprenskii's Pushkin. In Russian kiosks and supermarkets boxes of chocolates are available, as they were over one hundred years ago, emblazoned with a portrait of Pushkin. Fig. 151⁷⁶¹ shows one produced by the confectionery firm Krupskaia, with a high quality reproduction of the Tropinin portrait surrounded by ribbon and flowers, reminiscent of those boxes of chocolates sold in 1899. The Lomonosov Porcelain manufactory, like the Kuznetsov firm in 1899, markets a coffee cup decorated with a portrait of Pushkin. The visual representation of writers is still an integral part of Russian visual culture, although perhaps not as strong as it was in the Soviet era, when all collected works of authors contained a frontispiece portrait, usually one of those produced by the *Peredvizhniki*, and every school room was embellished with posters of Russia's great men of letters. Yet the establishment of writers' visual representations as a fundamental part of their reputation was not a Soviet

⁷⁶¹ Collection of the author.

creation but a nineteenth-century one. This thesis has aimed to demonstrate how and to what extent writers were visually represented in Russian society from 1860 to 1899. The simultaneous ambition of Tret'iakov to create a portrait gallery of notable Russian figures and developments in image reproduction meant that portraits and pictures of writers were available and accessible in Russian urban society; whether in the latest exhibition, on the front of a journal, as a cheap *vizitki* or discussed in an amusing feuilleton; the growing Russian reading public was continually exposed to images of their literary heroes.

Tret'iakov's series of commissions in the 1870s and 1880s and the reception of these portraits in reviews and essays firmly established the visual representation of writers as a topic for discussion and debate in Russian society. These were not private portraits, but portraits created specifically to be seen by the Russian public and therefore the way in which they presented their subject was paramount. They rarely included explicit symbols of the subject's national identity, but instead aimed to present a combination of personal and professional identity whilst still providing a good likeness. When works did not succeed in meeting all criteria they were often criticized, for example Ge's 1884 portrait of Tolstoi depicted the writer at work, but what was the point, reviews asked if it was impossible to see his face? However the portraits of the *Peredvizhniki* did not operate in isolation and the Russian public were able to compare these works with the numerous photographs and engravings of writers, the number of which increased as the century progressed. These images provided a growing urban, educated population with visible representatives of their imagined community, the tsar may have been the head of the Russian state, but Tolstoi, Dostoevskii, and Pushkin were the heads of the Russian reading public.

As advertising and consumer culture developed it was natural that those who wanted to sell a product should turn to those figures that were respected and recognized by a large proportion of the potential market. By the end of the nineteenth century writers were still respected, but in some cases this respect resulted in exploitation for commercial gain. A.S. Pushkin with his dramatic life and tragic end was not only a Russian writer who had produced great literary works, he was also a figure whose personal identity was interlinked with the tales and characters he had produced. The visual representation of Pushkin was a combination of the real and the fictitious that infiltrated everyday items from

clocks to matches. However, the iconography of Pushkin was firmly established and so whatever the quality of the portrait, the consumer knew immediately if it represented Pushkin. The variety and placement of representations of Pushkin in 1899 does not, in my opinion, point to the trivialisation of the position of the writer in Russian society, but is rather a natural conclusion, a zenith, to the evolution of the visual representation of writers, a process which began in earnest with the formation of Tret'iakov's portrait collection.

Appendix

Major Portraits of Russian writers and others 1860-1899

Dmitriev-Orenburgskii, Nikolai Dmitrievich (1837-1898)

I.S. Turgenev Hunting, 1879

oil on cardboard, 46.2 x 31.8 cm

Institute of Russian Literature, Academy of Sciences (*Pushkinskii dom*), St. Petersburg.

Ge, Nikolai Nikolaevich (1831-1894)

Portrait of A.I. Herzen, 1867

o/c, 78.8 x 62.6 cm (oval)

TG.

Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov, 1872

o/c, 106.7 x 80cm

RM.

Exhibited 2nd TAE; 3rd TAE (Moscow only).

Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, 1872

o/c, 102 x 85 cm

RM.

Exhibited 2nd TAE; 3rd TAE (Moscow only).

Portrait of I.S. Turgenev, 1872

o/c, 108 x 79.5cm

State Art Gallery of Armenia, Erevan.

Exhibited 1st TAE.

Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi, 1884

o/c, 95 x 71.2 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 12th TAE. Ge often made a number of copies of his paintings. Copies of this work were made in 1884 (RM), 1886 (*Pushkinskii Dom*) 1891 (State Museum of Tolstoi, Moscow and Iasnaia Poliana). The original was acquired by Tret'iakov in 1891.

Iaroshenko, Nikolai Aleksandrovich (1846-1898)

Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, 1886

o/c, 102 x 75.5cm

Location unknown.

Exhibited at the 15th TAE and the posthumous exhibition of the works of N.A. Iaroshenko, St. Petersburg 1898, Moscow, 1899.

Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi, 1894

o/c, 112 x 81 cm

Pushkinskii dom.

Exhibited at the 23rd TAE and the posthumous exhibition of the works of N.A. Iaroshenko, St. Petersburg 1898, Moscow, 1899.

Kramskoi, Ivan Nikolaevich (1837-1887)

Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi, 1873

o/c, 98 x 79.5 cm

TG.

Exhibited in Fine Art section, Russian Group, World Exhibition, Paris, 1878; Fine Art Section, All-Russian Exhibition, Moscow, 1882; PexINK.

Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi, 1873

o/c, 104 x 77 cm

Museum reserve Iasnaia Poliana.

Portrait of I.A. Goncharov, 1874

o/c, 114 x 94 cm

TG.

Exhibited at 4th TAE, Imperial Academy of Arts, February 1878 (works selected for the World Exhibition, Paris, 1878); PexINK.

Portrait of D.V. Grigorovich, 1876

o/c, 86 x 68 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 5th TAE; Imperial Academy of Arts, February 1878 (works selected for the World Exhibition, Paris, 1878); Fine Art section, Russian Group, World Exhibition, Paris, 1878; PexINK.

Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov, 1877

o/c, 76 x 55 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 6th TAE; PexINK. A student of Kramskoi's made two copies of this portrait which are now located in the N.A. Nekrasov Memorial Museum, St. Petersburg and the N.A. Nekrasov Memorial Museum, Karabikh, Iaroslavl Region.

N.A. Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs, 1877-78

o/c, 105 x 89cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 6th TAE; PexINK.

Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, 1879

o/c, 88 x 68 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 7th TAE; PexINK. Kramskoi made two copies of this portrait, one in 1879 and another which is undated. Both are in *Pushkinskii Dom*.

F.M. Dostoevskii on his death-bed, 1881,

57 x 44 cm

Pushkinskii dom.

Exhibited at PexINK.

The Poet A.N. Maikov Fishing, 1883

o/c, 90 x 67cm

State Literary Museum, Moscow.

Exhibited at the 12th TAE; PexINK.

Perov, Vasilii Grigor'evich (1834-1882)

Portrait of A.F. Pisemskii, 1869

o/c, 98 x 78.5 cm

Ivanov Museum of Art.

Exhibited at the Imperial Academy of Arts, 1869 and PexVGP.

Portrait of A.N. Ostrovskii, 1871

o/c, 103.5 x 80.7 cm

TG.

Exhibited at 1st TAE; PexVGP.

Portrait of V.I. Dal', 1872

o/c, 94 x 80.5 cm

TG.

Exhibited 2nd TAE; Fine Art Section, All-Russian Exhibition, Moscow, 1882; PexVGP.

Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii, 1872

o/c, 99 x 80.5 cm

TG.

Exhibited at 2nd TAE and 3rd TAE (Moscow only); Imperial Academy of Arts, February 1878 (works selected for the World Exhibition, Paris, 1878); Fine Art section, Russian Group, World Exhibition, Paris, 1878; Fine Art Section, All-Russian Exhibition, Moscow, 1882; PexVGP.

V.G. Perov, *Portrait of I.S. Kamynin*, 1872

o/c, 104 x 84.3 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 1st TAE (Moscow only), 2nd TAE.

Portrait of A.N. Maikov, 1872

o/c, 103.5 x 80.8 cm

TG.

Exhibited at 2nd TAE; PexVGP.

Portrait of M.P. Pogodin, 1872

o/c, 11.5 x 88.8 cm

TG.

Exhibited at 2nd TAE; 3rd TAE (Moscow only); Fine Art Section, All-Russian Exhibition, Moscow, 1882; PexVGP.

Portrait of I.S. Turgenev, 1872

o/c, 102 x 80cm

RM.

Exhibited at 2nd TAE; Fine Art Section, All-Russian Exhibition, Moscow, 1882; PexVGP.

Repin, Il'ia Efimovich (1844-1930)

Portrait of A.F. Pisemskii, 1880

o/c, 87 x 68 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 9th TAE.

L.N. Tolstoi in armchair, book in hand, 1887

o/c, 124 x 88cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 16th TAE.

The Ploughman, 1887

o/c, 28 x 4 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the 16th TAE. Exhibited alongside this small oil painting was a larger pencil sketch of Tolstoi ploughing, 12.7 x 19.7 cm, TG. Repin made five sketches in 1887 of Tolstoi ploughing.

L.N. Tolstoi in the Study at Iasnaia Poliana, 1891,

o/c, 64 x 90 cm

Pushkinskii dom.

Exhibited at the exhibition of works by I.E. Repin, Academy of Arts, St. Petersburg, 1891.

L.N. Tolstoi Resting in the Forest under a Tree, 1891,

o/c, 60 x 50 cm

TG.

Exhibited at the exhibition of works by I.E. Repin, Academy of Arts, St. Petersburg, 1891.

Bibliography

Primary Works

Abramov Z.M. (ed.), *Pis'ma khudozhnikov Pavlu Mikhailovichu Tret'iakovu 1870-1879*, Moscow, 1968.

‘Al'bom’, *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, no. 128, 12 May 1899, p. 2 and no. 137, 21 May 1899, p. 2.

Al'bom Pushkinskoi vystavki, ustroennoi Obshchestvom liubitelei rossiiskoi slovestnosti v zalakh Istoricheskogo muzeia v Moskve 29 maia-13 iunia 1899 g., Moscow, 1899.

Andreeva, V.V.
et al. (comps.), *Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok, 1869-1899, pis'ma, dokumenty*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1987.

Annenkov, P.V., *Materialy dlia biografii Aleksandra Sergeevicha Pushkina*, St. Petersburg, 1855 & 1873.

— *Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin v Aleksandrovskaia epokhu: 1799-1826*, St. Petersburg, 1874.

Anon., ‘XII peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin’, *Russkaia mysl'*, May 1884, p. 83.

A-ov, L., ‘Peredvizhnaia vystavka v Moskve’, *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 137, 2 June 1872, p. 3.

Betkhera, A., ‘V chem zakliuchaetsia tsvet?’, *Detskoe chetenie*, no. 4, April-June 1883, pp. 96-108.

Brodskii, I.A. (comp.), *I.E. Repin. Izbrannye pis'ma v dvukh tomakh 1867-1930*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1969.

Bulgakov, F.I. (ed.), *Venok na pamiatnik Pushkinu*, Moscow, 1880.

Catalogue de la Section russe à L'Exposition universelle de Paris, Paris, 1878.

‘Chetvertaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka’, *Golos*, 25 March 1875, pp. 2-4.

‘Chetvertaia peredvizhnaia vystavka’, *Pchela*, no. 10, 16 March 1875, pp. 121-126.

‘Chetvertaia peredvizhnaia vystavka v Akademii khudozhestv’, *Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti*, no. 85, 28 March 1875, pp. 1-2.

Dostoevskii, F.M., ‘Apropos of the Exhibition’, *A Writer's Diary*

- Volume One, 1873-76, trans. K. Lantz, Evanston, Illinois, 1993.
- *The Letters of Dostoevsky to His Wife*, trans. E. Hill and D. Mudie, London, 1930.
- Em., 'Khudozhestvennaia khronika', *Golos*, no. 88, 29 March 1879, pp. 1-2.
- Fedorov, M.P. (comp.), 'Perechen statei o pervykh 15-ti peredvizhnykh vystavakh v russkikh stolichenykh i provintsialnykh zhurnalakh 1871-1888 gg., in N.P. Sobko, *Illiustrirovannyi katalog XVIII-i peredvizhnoi vystavki 'Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok'*, St. Petersburg, 1890.
- 'Feleton: Peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Niva*, no. 51, 20 December 1871, pp. 818-819.
- Filonov, A., *Poet Pushkin. Obshchedostypnoe chtenie*, St. Petersburg, 1880.
- Glazenal, S. et al. (comps.), *Na pamiat' Nikolae Alekseeviche Nekrasove*, St. Petersburg, 1878.
- Gnedich, P.P et al (eds.), *Pushkinskii sbornik (v pamiat' stoletii dnia rozhdeniia poeta)*, St. Petersburg, 1899.
- Gol'dshtein, S.N. (ed.), *Perepiska I.N. Kramskogo*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1953-54.
- Golubev, A. (ed.), *Nikolai Alekseevich Nekrasov: biografiia, krticheskii obozor poezii, sobranie stikhotveoreonii, posviashchennykh pamiati poeta, svod statei o N.A. Nekrasove s 1840 goda*, St. Petersburg, 1878.
- Grigorenko, V.V. et al. (eds.), *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v vospominaniakh sovremennikov v dvukh tomakh*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1975.
- Herzen, A.I., *Sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh*, 30 vols. Moscow, 1963.
- Ia.U., 'Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda', *Russkaia starina*, November 1883, pp. 457-476.

Imperial Commission for the
Nijni Novgorod Exhibition., *Pan-Russian Exhibition of 1896 in Nijni
Novgorod. Guide-Book to the Town, the Fair, and
the Exhibition*, St. Petersburg, 1896.

‘K Pushkinskim torzhestvam’, *Peterburskaia gazeta*, no. 122, 6 May 1899, p. 3
& no. 125, 9 May 1899, p. 4.

K___v’, N., ‘Chetvertaia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin v
shkole zhivopisi i vaianiia’, *Sovremennye izvestiia*,
no. 112, 26 April 1875, p. 2.

Kalendar’ krestnyi na 1882, Moscow, 1881.

Katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Russkogo muzeia Imperatora Aleksandra III,
St. Petersburg, 1899.

*Katalog knig, graviur i raznykh predmetov, predstavlennykh na Pushkinskuiu
vystavku v g. Astrakhan*, Astrakhan, 1899.

*Katalog posmertnoi vystavki proizvedenii: I.I. Endogurova, I.I. Shishkina i N.A
Iaroshenko chlenov tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok*,
St. Petersburg, 1898.

*Katalog Pushkinskoi vystavki, ustroennoi komitetom Obshchestva dlia posobiia
nuzhdaiushchimsia literatorom i uchenym*, St. Petersburg, 1880.

Katalog Pushkinskoi vystavki v Moskovskoi 5 gimnazii v oktiabre 1899,
Moscow, 1899.

Katalog Pushkinskoi vystavki v Odesse, Odessa, 1899.

Katalog vystavki kartin, etiudov i risunkov N.A. Iaroshenko, Moscow, 1899.

Katalog vystavki kartin, portretov, eskizov i etiudov I.E. Repina v 1891, St.
Petersburg, 1891.

Khud. A.L., ‘7-ia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka’,
Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti, no. 89, 31 March
1879, pp. 1-2.

‘Khudozhestvennye novosti’, *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 42, 15 October 1889,
p. 255.

Khudozhnik-liubitel’, ‘Na svoikh nogakh. (Po povodu pervoi
khudozhestvennoi vystavki Tovarishchestva
peredvizhnykh vystavok)’, *Delo*, 1871, pp. 106-
118.

Kleman, M.K., &

- Mogilanskii, A.P. (eds.), *Literaturnyi Arkhiv: A.F. Pisemskii. Pis'ma*. Moscow-Leningrad, 1936.
- Knowles, A.V. (ed. & trans.), *Turgenev's Letters*, London, 1983.
- Kovalevskii, P.M., 'Vtoraia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin russkikh khudozhnikov', *Otechestvennye zapiski*, January 1873, pp. 93-104.
- Kramskoi, I.N., 'O Portrete F.M. Dostoevskago'. *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal*, March 1881.
- 'L', 'Pervaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 239, 4 December 1871, p. 2.
- Lebedev, A.I., *Karikaturnyi al'bom sovremennykh russkikh deiatelei*, St. Petersburg, 1879.
- Librovich, S., *Pushkin v portretakh. Istoriia izobrazheniia poeta v zhivopisi, graviure, skul'pture*, St. Petersburg, 1890.
- Literaturnyi illiustrirovannyi kalendar' na 1887*, Moscow, 1887.
- Lobanov, D.I. (comp.), *Russkie sovremennye deiateli. Sbornik portretov zamechatel'nykh lits nastoiashchago vremeni s biograficheskimi ocherkami*, 4 vols. St. Petersburg, vol. I, 1876. vol. II, 1877, vol. III, 1878, vol. IV, 1879.
- , *Nashi deiateli. Galereia zamechatel'nykh liudei Rossii v portretakh i biografiakh*, 4 vols. St. Petersburg, vol. V, 1879, vol. VI, 1879, vol. VII, 1880, vol. VIII, 1880.
- Maikov, L.N., & Modzalevskii, B.L. (eds.), *Al'bom Pushkinskoi iubileinoi vystavki v Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk v S. Peterburge. Mai 1899*, Moscow, 1899.
- Malenkii khudozhnik, 'XII vystavka tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh vystavok', *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 10, 10 March 1884, p. 154.
- 'Melochi o Peterburgskoi zhizni', *Illiustrirovannia gazeta*, no. 13, 26 March 1878, p. 106.
- Merezhkovskii, D.S., 'Prazdnik Pushkina', *Mir iskusstva*, no. 13-14,

1899, pp. 11-23.

Mikhnevich V., *Nashi znakomye*, St. Petersburg, 1884.

Miunster, A.E., *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1865-1869.

Moskovskii publichnyi i Rumiantsov muzei. Pushkinskaia vystavka 1899 g. Ukazatel', Moscow, 1899.

‘Na fotograficheskoi vystavke’, *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 57, 27 February 1888, p. 2.

Nekrasov, N.A., *Stikhotvoreniia N.A. Nekrasova. Posmertnoe izdanie. Tom I 1845-1860*, St. Petersburg, 1879.

— *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii N.A. Nekrasova v dvukh tomakh 1842-1872*, St. Petersburg, 1886.

Novitskii, A.P., *Kratkii istoricheskii obzor' kartinnoi galerei P.M. Tret'iakova*, Moscow, 1893.

‘Novyi portret Pushkina’, *Zhivopisnoe obzorenie*, no. 46, 12 November 1883, p.1

N.T. ‘Vystavka kartin “Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok”’, *Peterburgskaia gazeta* no. 52, 15 March 1878, p. 2.

Obshchepoleznyi kalendar' na 1890, Moscow, 1889.

Official Programme of the Various Performances arranged to be given in connection with the London Shakespeare Tercentenary Festival, London, 1864.

Opis' khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii gorodskoi galerei Pavla i Sergeia Tret'iakovykh, Moscow, 1893.

Orlova, O.P., *Dva poseshcheniia s de'ti Tret'iakovskoi galerei*, Moscow, 1898.

Ostrogorskii, V.P. (comp.), *Izdanie S-Peterburgskoi gorodskoi dumy v pamiat' stoletnei godovshchiny rozhdeniia velikago russkago poeta, 26 maia 1799 Aleksandr Sergeevich Pushkin*, St. Petersburg, 1899.

‘Otkrytie pamiatnika Pushkinu, v Moskve’, *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 598, 21 June 1880, p. 506.

Pamiati A.S. Pushkina. Iubileinyi sbornik. Izdanie redaksii zhurnala Zhizn', St. Petersburg, 1899.

- P.E., 'Shestaia peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 483, 8 April 1878, p. 243.
- 'Peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka v Akademii Khudozhestv', *Golos*, no. 12, 12 January 1873, p. 2.
- 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka v Akademii khudozhestva', *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, no. 211, 13 January 1873, p. 51.
- 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka v Kishineve', *Bessarabskie oblastnye vedomosti*, no. 81, 13 October 1873, p. 394.
- 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Elizavetgradskii vestnik*, no.37, 4 November 1876, p.1.
- 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 95, 16 April 1879, p. 3.
- 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 48, 19 February 1895, p. 3.
- 'Peterburgskaia khronika', *Golos*, no. 332, 1 December 1871, p. 2.
- 'Peterburgskaia pis'ma', *Illustrirovannaia gazeta*, no. 7, 15 February 1873, p. 11.
- Pervaia Vserossiiskaia vystavka pechatnago dela*, St. Petersburg, 1895.
- P___nii, 'Tret'ia peredvizhnaia vystavka v Moskve', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 139, 4 June 1874, p. 3.
- _____, '4-ia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin v Moskve', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 124, 18 May 1875, p. 4.
- Polevoi, N.P., *Istoriia russkoi literatury v ocherkakh i biografiakh*, St. Petersburg, 1872-1890.
- 'Portretnaia galereia', *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal*, vol. I, 1881, p. 36.
- Polivanov, L. (ed.), *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
- Pushkin, A.S., *The Complete Works of Aleksandr Pushkin. Volume II. Letters 1826-1833*, J.Thomas Shaw (trans.), Downham Market, 2002.
- _____, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Moscow, 1995.

Pushkinskaia iubileinaia vystavka v Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk v S. Peterburge. Katalog, St. Petersburg, 1899.

■ 'Pushkinskaia vystavka', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, no. 127, 11 May 1899, p. 2 and no. 128, 12 May 1899, p. 2.

■ 'Pushkinskii prazdnik v Moskve', *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 25, 21 June 1880, pp. 467-470.

Pushkinskii prazdnik v zalakh i sadu Tavricheskago dvortsa, St. Petersburg, 1899.

Repin, I.E., *Dalekoe blizkoe*, Moscow, 1953.

Romanov, N.Ia. (ed.), *Iubileinyi sbornik (26 maia 1899). Istoriko-literaturnykh statei o Pushkine*, St. Petersburg, 1899.

■ Rovinskii, D.A., *Nikolai Ivanovich Utkin: ego zhizn' i proizvedeniia*, St. Petersburg, 1884.

— *Slovar' russkikh gravirovannykh portretov*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1889.

— *Podrobnyi slovar' russkikh graverov XVI-XIX vv.* St. Petersburg, 1895.

'Russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka v Rige', *Rizhskii vestnik*, no. 74, 2 April 1873, p. 2 and no. 76, 4 April 1873, p. 2.

Russkie deiateli v portretakh, gravirovannykh akademikom Lavrentiem Seriakovym, 5 vols. St. Petersburg, vol. I, 1882, vol. II, 1886, vol. III, 1889, vol. IV, 1890, vol. V, 1890.

Saltykov-Shchedrin, M.E., 'Pervaia russkaia peredvizhnaia khudozhestvennaia vystavka', *Otechestvennye zapiski*, December 1871, pp. 268-276.

— *The Golovlyov Family*, trans. R. Wilks, London, 1988.

Sbornik statei ob A.S. Pushkine po povodu stoletniago iubileia, Kiev, 1899.

Semevskii, M., *Lavrentii Avekent'evich Seriakov 1824-1881*, St. Petersburg, 1881.

Shapiro, K.A., *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh i artistov s biografiiami i faksimilie*, 2 vols. St. Petersburg, 1880.

- 'Pis'mo v redaktsiiu', *Novosti i birzhevsia gazeta*, no. 34, 6 February 1881, p. 3.
- Shkilarevskii, A., *Ocherki tret'ei Peredvizhnoi vystavki*, Kiev, 1875.
- Shokoladnaia biblioteka: stikhotvoreniia A.S. Pushkina*, St. Petersburg, 1895.
- 'XVI vystavka kartin tovarishchestva peredvizhnikov', *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, 1 March 1888, p. 2.
- Skromnyi nabliudatel', 'Sed'maia peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin', *Russkie vedomosti*, no. 92, 15 April 1879, pp. 1-2.
- Sobko, N.P., 'Zhizn' i proizvedeniia L.A. Seriakova', *Russkaia starina*, February and June 1881.
- *Illiustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki v Moskve, 1882 g.*, Moscow, 1882.
- *Illiustrirovannyi katalog posmertnoi vystavki proizvedenii V.G. Perova (1833-1882)*, St. Petersburg, 1883.
- *Illiustrirovannyi katalog kartin, risunkov i graviur pokoinago I.N. Kramskogo (1837-1887)*, St. Petersburg, 1887.
- *Illiustrirovannyi katalog XVII-i peredvizhnoi vystavki, 'Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok'*, St. Petersburg, 1889.
- *Illiustrirovannyi katalog XVIII-i peredvizhnoi vystavki 'Tovarishchestva peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok'*, St. Petersburg, 1890.
- *Vasilii Grigor'evich Perov: ego zhizn' i proizvedeniia*, St. Petersburg, 1892.
- Solov'ev, M., 'Dvenadsataia peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Moskovskie vedomosti*, no. 88, 28 March 1884.
- Somov, A.I., 'Vtoraia peredvizhnaia vystavka', *Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti*, no. 23, 23 January 1873, p. 1.
- Saryi znakomyi 'Petersburgskii listok – Vystavka kartin v

- Akademii Khudozhestv', *Birzhevye vedomosti*, 5 December 1871.
- Stasov, V.V., 'Posle Vsemirnoi vystavki 1862 g.', *Izbrannoe: zhivopis', skul'ptura, grafika v dvukh tomakh*, 2 vols. vol. II, Moscow, 1950-51, pp. 235-272.
- 'Nikolai Petrovich Sobko. Nekrolog', *Stat'i i zametki, publikovavshiesia v gazetakh i ne voshedshie v knizhnye izdaniia*, Moscow, 1952, pp. 198-200.
- 'Portret L'va Tolstogo', *Stat'i i zametki, publikovavshiesia v gazetakh i ne voshedshie v knizhnye izdaniia*, Moscow, 1952, pp. 94-96.
- 'Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov i ego kartinnaia galereia', *Stat'i i zametki, ne voshedshie v sobraniia sochinenii*, Moscow, 1954, pp. 376-416.
- 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka 1871 goda', *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti*, nos. 333 & 338, 1871. C. Adlam (trans.), <http://hri.shef.ac.uk/rva/texts/stasov/stas09/stas09.html>
- (ed.), *Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi: ego zhizn', perepiska i khudozhestvenno-kriticheskie stat'i, 1837-1887*, St. Petersburg, 1888.
- Stead, W., *The Art of Advertising. Its Theory and Practise Fully Described*, London, 1899.
- Stronnii zritel' 'Vystavka i auktsion kartin V.G. Perova', *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal*, January 1883, pp. 61-65.
- 'Vystavki peredvizhnaia i akademicheskaiia', *Khudozhestvennyi zhurnal*, May 1887, pp. 327-330.
- Sytin, I.D., *Zhizn' dlia knigi*, Moscow, 1962.
- Tikhomirov, D.I. (ed.), *Pushkinskii sbornik*, Moscow, 1899.
- Tiunkina, K. (comp.), *F.M. Dostoevskii v vospominaniiakh sovremennikov*, 2 vols. Moscow, 1990.
- Tolokonnikov, 'Peredvizhnaia vystavka kartin', *Sovremennye izvestiia*, no. 104, 9 May 1874, p. 2.

Torzhestvo otkrytiia pamiatnika A.S. Pushkina v Moskve 6 iunia 1880 g.
Moscow, 1880.

Trutovskii, K., 'Vospominaniia o Fedore Mikhailoviche
Dostoevskom, *Russkoe obozrenie*, 1893, pp. 212-
217.

Turgenev, I.S., *Sochineniia I.S. Turgeneva (1844-1868-1874-
1880). Tom pervyi*, Moscow, 1880.

— *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I.S. Turgenev*, vol. I,
St. Petersburg, 1884.

— *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v dvadtsati
vos'mi tomakh*, 28 vols. Moscow-Leningrad 1965.

V...ov, 'Iz Peterburgskoi zhizni. Otkrytye 4-oi
peredvizhnoi vystavki', *Sankt Peterburgskie
vedomosti*, no. 59, 2 March 1875, p. 2.

Vseobshchii kalendar' na 1882, St. Petersburg, 1882.

'Vystavka kartin Obshchestva peredvizhnykh vystavok', *Peterburgskii listok*,
no. 46, 7 March 1879, p. 2.

*Vystavka khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii, naznachennykh dlia Parizhskoi
Vsemirnoi vystavki 1878 goda*, St. Petersburg, 1878.

Zhivopisnyi obikhodnyi kalendar', St. Petersburg, 1882.

Secondary Works

Adariukov, V.Ia., *Ocherk po istorii litografii v Rossii*, St. Petersburg,
1912.

— *Ukazatel' gravirovannykh i litografirovannykh
portretov A.S. Pushkina*, Moscow, 1926.

Adlam, C., 'Realist Aesthetics in Nineteenth-Century Russian
Art Writing', *The Slavonic and East European
Review*, vol. 83, no. 4, October 2005, pp. 1-26.

Alekseev, A.D. (ed.), *I.A. Goncharov v portretakh, illiustratsiakh,
dokumentakh*, Leningrad, 1960.

Aleshina, L.S., &
Sternin, G. Iu., *Obrazy i liudei Serebriannogo veka*, Moscow,
2002.

- Allenova, O., *Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia galereia. Putevoditel'*, Moscow, 1997.
- Anderson, B., *Imagined Communities*, London, 1991.
- Anderson, P., *The Printed Image and the Transformation of Popular Culture 1790-1860*, Oxford, 1991.
- Androsov, S.O., *Zhivopisets Ivan Nikitin*, St. Petersburg, 1998.
- Arbuzov G.S., & Stepanova, G.V. (comps.), *Opisanie izobrazitel'nykh materialov Pushkinskogo doma. VI A.N. Ostrovskii*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1960.
- Ardens, N.N., *Dostoevskii i Tolstoi*, Moscow, 1970.
- Ashbee, F., 'The Carricks of St. Petersburg', in *The Caledonian Phalanx. Scots in Russia*, Edinburgh, 1987, pp. 91-105.
- Auty, R., & Obolensky, D. (eds.), *An Introduction to Russian Art and Architecture*, Cambridge, 1980.
- Baburina, N.I., *Russkii plakat. Vtoraia polovina XIX-nachalo XX veka*, Leningrad, 1988.
- Bajac, Q., *The Invention of Photography*, London, 2002.
- Barlow, P., 'Facing the past and present: the National Portrait Gallery and the search for "authentic portraiture"', in J. Woodall (ed.), *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, Manchester, 1997, pp. 219-238.
- Baskakov, V.N. (comp.), *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v portretakh, illiustratsiakh, dokumentakh*, Leningrad, 1968.
- Bazanov, B.G., et al. (eds.) 'Novonaidennye i zabytye pis'ma Dostoevskogo', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 86, 1973, pp. 114-152.
- Becker, C., 'Raznochintsy: The Development of the Word and of the Concept', *American Slavic and East European Review*, vol. 18, 1959, pp. 63-74.
- Beliaev, M.D., 'Zametki na poliakh knigi S. Librovia Pushkin v portretakh', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 16-18, 1934, pp. 968-979.

- Belknap, R., 'Survey of Russian Journals, 1840-1880', in D. Martinsen (ed.), *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 91-116.
- Benois, A., *The Russian School of Painting*, London, 1916.
- Bespalova, N.I., & Vanslov, V.V. (eds.), *Russkaia progressivnaia khudozhestvennaia kritika vtoroi poloviny XIX-nachala XX veka: khrestomatiia*, Moscow, 1977.
- Bespalova, N.I., & Vereschagina, A.G., *Russkaia progressivnaia khudozhestvennaia kritika vtoroi poloviny XIX*, Moscow, 1979.
- Binyon, T.J., *Pushkin: A Biography*, London, 2002.
- Bird, A., *A History of Russian Painting*, Oxford, 1987.
- Bird, P., *Nineteenth-Century Fashion*, London, 1992.
- Bitovt, Iu., *Graf L.N. Tolstoi v karrikaturakh i anekdotakh*, Moscow, 1908.
- , *V pamiat' L.N. Tolstogo. Al'bom izobrazhenii Tolstogo i o Tolstom*, Moscow, 1911.
- Black, B., *On Exhibit: Victorians and their Museums*, Charlottesville & London, 2000.
- Borskii, B., 'Ikonografiia Pushkina do portretov Kiprenskogo i Tropinina', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol.16-18, Moscow, 1934, pp. 961-968.
- Botkina, A.P., *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov v zhizni i iskusstve*, Moscow, 1993.
- Bowl, J. (ed.), *Russian Art of the Avant Garde*, London, 1991.
- Bowman, H.E., *Vissarion Belinskii. A Study in the Origins of Social Criticism in Russia*, Camb. Mass., 1954.
- Bradley, J., 'Voluntary Associations, Civic Culture, and Obshchestvennost' in Moscow', in E.W. Clowes et al. (eds.), *Between Tsar and People. Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, Princeton, 1991, pp. 131-148.
- Brilliant, R., *Portraiture*, London, 1997.

- Brodskii, I.A. (comp.), *L.N. Tolstoi i khudozhniki. L.N. Tolstoi ob iskusstve pis'ma, dnevniki, vospominaniia*, Moscow, 1978.
- Brooks, J., *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and popular Literature 1861-1917*, Princeton, 1985.
- Brown, W.E., *A History of Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature*, Ann Arbor, 1980.
- Bruka, Ia.V. (ed.), *Orest Kipresnkii. Perepiska, dokumenty, svidetel'stva sovremennikov*, St. Petersburg, 1994.
- Brumfield, W.C., *Gold in Azure 1000 Years of Russian Architecture*, Boston, Mass., 1983.
- Burke, P., *Eyewitnessing: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence*, London, 2001.
- Caffiero, G., & Samarine, I., *Seas, Cities and Dreams: The Paintings of Ivan Aivazovsky*, London, 2000.
- Cardoso, D.R., & Trodd, C. (eds.), *Art and the Academy in the Nineteenth Century*, Manchester, 2000.
- Chekina, L.V., *Obraz L.N. Tolstogo v izobrazitel'nom iskusstve*, Moscow, 1960.
- Churbanov, V., 'Rumiantsev's Ark: Library of a Nation', *Rossica*, Autumn 2003-Winter 2004, pp. 4-24.
- Clowes, E.W. et al. (eds.), *Between Tsar and People. Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, Princeton, 1991.
- Cooke, C., 'Shekhtel in Kelvingrove and Mackintosh on the Petrovka: Two Russo-Scottish Exhibitions at the Turn of the Century', *Scottish Slavonic Review*, 10, spring 1988, pp. 177-205.
- Cormack, R. (ed.), *The Art of Holy Russia: Icons from Moscow 1400-1600*, London, 1998.
- Cracraft, J., *The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery*, Chicago, 1997.

- Debreczeny, P., 'Puškin's Reputation in Nineteenth-Century Russia. A Statistical Approach' in D.M. Bethea (ed.), *Puškin Today*, Bloomington, Ind., 1993, pp. 201-213.
- Dement'ev A.G. et al. (eds.), *Russkaia periodicheskaia pechat' (1702-1894)*, Moscow, 1959.
- Dianina, K., 'The Feuilleton: An Everyday Guide to Public Culture in the Age of the Great Reforms', *Slavic and East European Journal*, vol. 47, no.2, Summer 2003, pp. 187-210.
- Dmitrieva, N., *Moskovskoe uchilishche zhivopisi, vaianiia i zodchestva*, Moscow, 1951.
- Dostoevskaia, A. (comp.), *Gosudarstvennyi Istoricheskii Muzei. Muzei na pamiati F.M. Dostoevskago*, St. Petersburg, 1906.
- Dostoevskaia, A., *Dostoevsky Reminiscences*, London, 1976.
- Durkin, A., 'Chekhov and the Journals of his Time', in D. Martinsen (ed.), *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 228-245.
- Edie, J.M., Scanlan, J.P., & Zeldin, M.B. (eds.), *Russian Philosophy*, 3 vols. Chicago, 1965.
- Edwards, J.I., 'Looking for Abram Hannibal. Some Observations on the Supposed Portraits of Abram Petrovich Hannibal (1696-1781) the African Great-Grandfather of Aleksandr Pushkin', *Slavonica* vol. 9, no. 1, 2003, pp. 19-33.
- Efimova, L.V. et al. (eds.), *Kostium v Rossii XV-nachala XX veka: iz sobraniia Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo muzeia*, Moscow, 2000.
- Efros, A.M., *Risunki poeta*, Moscow, 1933.
- , 'Sovetskoe khudozhniki na pushkinskom iubilee', *Sovetskoe iskusstvo*, 11 February 1937, p. 4 and 18 February 1937, p. 2.
- Ehre, M., *Oblomov and his creator: the life and art of Ivan Goncharov*, Princeton, 1973.
- Eklof, B. et al. (eds.), *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*, Bloomington, 1994.

- Elliot, D., *Photography in Russia 1840-1940*, London, 1992.
- Ely, C., *This Meager Nature. Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*, De Kalb Illinois, 2002.
- Ettinger, P., 'Saltykov v izobrazitel'nom iskusstve', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol.13-14, 1934, pp. 555-568.
- Evangulova, O.S., *Portretnaia zhivopis' v rossii vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1994.
- Falla, P. et al. (eds.), *The Oxford Russian Dictionary*, Oxford, 2000.
- Fedorov-Davydov, A.A. et al. (eds.), *V.G. Perov: Prilozheniia, dokumenty, pis'ma i rasskazy, katalog proizvedenii, bibliografiia*, Moscow, 1934.
- Feinstein, E., *Pushkin*, London, 1998.
- Fevchuk, L.P., 'Pervye skul'pturnye izobrazheniia Pushkina', in M.M. Kalaushin (ed.), *Pushkin i ego vremia: sbornik statei*, Leningrad, 1962, pp. 395-407.
- Figes, O., *Natasha's Dance. A Cultural History of Russia*, London, 2002.
- Flint, K., *The Victorians and the Visual Imagination*, Cambridge, 2000.
- Freeborn, R., *The Rise of the Russian Novel*, Cambridge, 1973.
- Freedberg, D., *The Power of Images*, Chicago, 1989.
- Funnell, P., *Victorian Portraits in the National Portrait Gallery*, London, 1996.
- Galinka, E.N. (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Pervoi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1966.
- Gdalin, A.D., *Pamiatniki A.S. Pushkinu: Istoriia. Opisanie. Bibliografiia. Tom I. Rossiia. Chast' I. Sant-Peterburg, Leningradskii oblast'*, St. Petersburg, 2001.
- Gilmore, E. Holt. (ed.), *The Expanding World of Art, 1874-1902*, New Haven, 1988.

- Gol'dshtein, S.N., 'Iz istorii sozdania proizvedeniia I.N. Kramskogo "Nekrasov v period posledenykh pesen"', in E. Butorina (ed.), *Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia galereia: materialy i issledovaniia*, vol. II, Moscow, 1958, pp. 155-159.
- *Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo*, Moscow, 1965.
- (ed.), *Portretnaia zhivopis' peredvizhnikov*, Moscow, 1972.
- Gollerbakh, E.F., *Istoriia graviury i litografii v Rossii*, Moscow-Petrograd, 1923.
- (comp.), *N.A. Nekrasov v portretakh i illiustratsiiakh*, Leningrad, 1938.
- (comp.), *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin v portretakh i illiustratsiiakh*, Leningrad, 1939.
- Golubev, V.Z., *Pushkin v izobrazhenii Repina*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936.
- Gorbacheva, S.M., & Iamshchikov, S.V. (comp.), *Russki avarel'nyi karandashnyi portret pervoi poloviny XIX veka iz muzeev RSFSR*, Moscow, 1987.
- Gorina, T., 'Portret A.I. Gertsena', *Khudozhnik*, no.1, 1970, p. 46.
- Gorlin, M., 'The Interrelation of Painting and Literature in Russia', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 23, 1946-47, pp. 134-148.
- Gosudarstvennaia kartinnaia galereia Armenii*, Moscow, 1986.
- Gould, V., Franklin, *G.F. Watts. The Last Great Victorian*, New Haven, 2004.
- Gray, R.P., 'Muscovite Patrons of European Painting: the Collections of Vasily Kokorev, Dmitry Botkin and Segei Tretyakov', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 10/2, 1998, pp. 189-198.
- The Golitsyn and Kushelev-Bezborodko Collections and their Role in the Evolution of Public Art Galleries in Russia', *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. XXXI, Oxford, 1998, pp. 51-67.

- *Russian Genre Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, Oxford, 2000.
- Greenhalgh, P., *Ephemeral Vistas. The Expositions Universelle*, Manchester, 1988.
- Grierson, R. (ed.), *Gates of Mystery: The Art of Holy Russia*, Cambridge, 1992.
- Griffiths, A., *Prints and Printmaking*, London, 1996.
- Grossman, L., 'Pushkin i denezizm', *Etiudy o Pushkine*, Moscow-Petrograd, 1923, pp. 5-36.
- Grudinina, I.E. (comp.), *Opisanie rukopisei i izobrazitel'nykh materialov pushkinskogo doma. IV I.S. Turgenev*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1958.
- Hamilton, G.H., *The Art and Architecture of Russia*, London, 1983.
- Hare, R., *The Art and Artists of Russia*, London, 1965.
- Hargreaves, R., 'Putting Faces to the Names: Social and Celebrity Portrait Photography', in P. Hamilton & R. Hargreaves (eds.), *The Beautiful and the Damned. The Creation of Identity in Nineteenth Century Photography*, London, 2001, pp. 17-56.
- Harvey, J., *Men in Black*, London, 1995.
- Honour, H., *Romanticism*, London, 1991.
- Hoover, M.L., *Alexander Ostrovsky*, Boston, 1981.
- Hosking, G., *Russia: People and Empire, 1552-1917*, London, 1997.
- Hughes, L., 'Images of the Elite: a Reconsideration of the Portrait in Seventeenth-Century Russia', *Von Moskau nach St. Petersburg: Das russische Reich im 17. Jahrhundert (Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte)*, Wiesbaden, 2000, pp. 167-185.
- *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great*, New Haven, 1998.
- 'Zhivopisets Ivan Nikitin', *Newsletter of the Study Group on 18th Century Russia*, no. 27, 1999, pp.

56-62.

Hughes, L.K., 'A Woman Poet Angling for Notice: Rosamund Marriott Watson', in M. Demoor (ed.), *Marketing the Author: Authorial Personae, Narrative Selves and Self-Fashioning, 1880-1930*, Basingstoke, 2004, pp. 134-155.

Iasnaia Poliana. Zhizn' L.N. Tolstogo. Al'bom ispolnennyi foto-tinto graviuroi, 1910.

Iaromlinsky, A., *Turgenev: The Man, His Art and His Age*, New York, 1977.

Iganatov, I., *Gallereia russkikh pisatelei*, Moscow, 1901.

Ivan Nikolaevich Kramskoi 1837-1887. Katalog vystavki k stoletiiu so dnia rozhdeniia, Moscow-Leningrad, 1937.

Ivanov, D.D., *Ob'iasnitel'nyi putevoditel' po khudozhestvennym sobraniiam Peterburga*, St. Petersburg, 1904.

Ivanov-Natov, A., *Ikonografiia F.M. Dostoevskogo*, Bayville, New Jersey, 1981

Ivashevskaiia, G., *Portraiture*, Leningrad, 1991.

Jones, W.G., *Nikolai Novikov: Enlightener of Russia*, Cambridge, 1984.

Jordanova, L., *Defining Features: Scientific and Medical Portraits 1660-2000*, London, 2000.

Karpova, T., *Smysl litsa. Russkii portret vtoroi poloviny XIX veka. Opyt samopoznaniia lichnosti*, St. Petersburg, 2000.

Katalog khudozhestvennago otdela russkogo muzeia imperatora Aleksandra III, St. Petersburg, 1911.

Katalog khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii gorodskoi gallerei Pavla i Sergeia Tret'iakovykh, Moscow, 1917, p. 36.

Kelly, C., *Russian Literature. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford, 2001.

Kelly, C., & Lovell, S. (eds.), *Russian Literature, Modernism and the Visual Arts*, Cambridge, 2000.

Kelly, C., & Volkov, V., 'Obshchestvennost', *Sobornost'*: Collective

- Identities', in C. Kelly & D. Shepherd (eds.), *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940*, Oxford, 1998, pp. 26-27.
- Kirichenko, E., *Russian Design and the Fine Arts 1750–1917*, New York, 1991.
- Koka, G., 'Portret Pushkina', *Tvorchestvo*, no. 2, 1962, pp. 23-24.
- Korostin, A.F., *Russkaia litografiia*, Moscow, 1953.
- Kovalevskaia, E.A. & Maniulov, V.A. (comps.), *M.Iu. Lermontov v portretakh, illiustratsiiakh, dokumentakh*, Leningrad, 1959.
- Krasovskii, Iu., 'Nekrasovskii portret raboty I.P. Pozhalostin', *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, vol. 53-54, 1949, pp. 193-196.
- Kublitskaia, M., 'Tepericha Pushkin v mode...', *Doma u Pushkina*, special edition of *Ars Peterburg, Rossiiskii zhurnal iskusstv*, St. Petersburg, 1994, pp. 91-95.
- Lapshin, V.P., 'Biografiia portretov F.M. Dostoevskogo v pismakh, otzyvakh, dokumentakh i vospominaniiakh', *Panorama iskusstv*, Moscow, 1978, pp. 242-264.
- , 'Biografiia portretov L.N. Tolstogo raboty I.N. Kramskogo, raskazannaia v pismakh, otzyvakh i vospominaniiakh', *Panorama iskusstv* 3, Moscow, 1980, pp. 244-283.
- Levitt, M.C., *Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880*, New York, 1989.
- , 'Pushkin in 1899', in B. Gasparov et al. (eds.), *Cultural Mythologies of Russian Modernism. From the Golden Age to the Silver Age*, Berkeley, 1992, pp. 183-203.
- Lindenmeyr, A., 'The Rise of Voluntary Associations during the Great Reforms', in B. Eklof et al. (eds.), *Russia's Great Reforms, 1855-1881*, Bloomington, 1994, pp. 264-279.
- McReynolds, L., *The News Under Russia's Old Regime*, Princeton, 1991.

- McReynolds, L., & Popkin, C., 'The Objective Eye and the Common Good', in C. Kelly & D. Shepherd (eds.), *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution: 1881-1940*, Oxford, 1998, pp. 58-105.
- Madariaga, I. de., *Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great*, New Haven & London, 1981.
- Magarshack, D., *Turgenev: A Life*, London, 1954.
- Makhrov, A., 'The Pioneers of Russian Art Criticism: Between State and Public Opinion, 1804-1855', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 81, no. 3, July 2003, pp. 614-633.
- Martinsen, D.A. (ed.), *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*, Cambridge, 1997.
- Merezhkovskii, D.S., *L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii*, Moscow, 1903.
- Mikhailova, N.I., 'Shokolad russkikh poetov –Pushkin', in M.N. Virolainen (ed.), *Legendy i mify o Pushkine*, St. Petersburg, 1994, pp. 282-287.
- Mikhailovich, N. Grand Duke of Russia, *Russkie portrety XVIII i XIX vekov*, St. Petersburg, 1905-1909.
- Miroliubova, G.A., & Petrova, T.A., *Peterburgskii al'bom. Fotografii iz kollektsii Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha*, Moscow, 2002.
- *St. Petersburg. A 300th Birthday Tribute. People and Places around 1900. Handlist of Exhibits*, London, 2003.
- Molok, Iu., *Pushkin v 1937 godu*, Moscow, 2000.
- Morgunova, N.N. (ed.), *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Vtoroi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1963.
- *Ocherki po istorii russkogo portreta. Kontsa XIX nachala XX veka*, Moscow, 1964.
- Morozov, S., *Russkaia khudozhestvennaia fotografiia 1839-1917*, Moscow, 1955.
- Moser, C.A., *Pisemsky: A Provincial Realist*, Cambridge, Mass., 1969.

- Nashchokina, M., *Khudozhestvennaia otkrytka russkogo moderna*, Moscow, 2004.
- Nechaeva, V.S. (ed.), *F.A. Dostoevskii v portretakh, illiustratsiiakh, dokumentakh*, Moscow, 1972.
- Nenarokomova, I., *Pavel Mikhailovich Tret'iakov i ego galereia*, Moscow, 1998.
- Nikitin, Iu.A., *Vystavochnyi Peterburg. Ot ekspozitsionnoi zaly do LENEKSPLO*, Cherepovets, 2003.
- Nochlin, L., *Realism*, Harmondsworth, 1971.
- Noinov, V., *V.V. Mate*, Leningrad, 1927.
- Norman, G., *The Hermitage*, London, 1997.
- Norman, J.O., 'Pavel Tret'iakov and Merchant Art Patronage, 1850-1900', in E.W. Clowes et al. (eds.), *Between Tsar and People. Educated Society and the Quest for Public Identity in Late Imperial Russia*, Princeton, 1991, pp. 93-107.
- Olkhovskii, Iu., *Vladimir Stasov and Russian National Culture*, Ann Arbor, 1983.
- Ostroi, O.S., & Saksonova, I.Kh., *Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka. Izobrazitel'noe i prikladnoe iskusstvo*, St. Petersburg, 2002.
- Ozhegov, S.I., *Slovar' russkogo iazyka*, Moscow, 1981.
- Paramanov, A., *Nashi muzei. Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia galereia*, Moscow, 1963.
- Pavlova, E.V., 'Portrety Pushkina', in L.I. Vuich (comp.), *Moskovskaia izobrazitel'naia pushkiniana*, Moscow, 1986, pp. 11-48.
- _____, *A.S. Pushkin v portretakh*, Moscow, 1989.
- Perry, L., 'Nationalizing Watts: the *Hall of Fame* and the National Portrait Gallery', in C. Trodd & S. Brown (eds.), *Representations of G.F. Watts. Art Making in Victorian Culture*, Aldershot, 2004, pp. 121-133.

- Petrova, E. (ed.), *The State Russian Museum. St. Petersburg: A Portrait of the City and its Citizens. A Celebration of the Tercentenary of St. Petersburg*, St. Petersburg, 2003.
- Pevzner, L., 'Kto zh avtor originala?' *Khudozhnik*, no. 12, 1968, pp. 33-36.
- Piper, D., *The Image of the Poet, British Poets and their Portraits*, Oxford, 1982.
- Pipes R. (ed.), *The Russian Intelligentsia*, New York, 1961.
- Pishchulin, Iu.P., *I.S. Turgenev. Zhizn'. Iskusstvo. Vremia*, Moscow, 1998.
- Polunina, N.M., *Kto est' kto v kolleksionirovanii staroi Rossii*, Moscow, 2003.
- Porudominskii, V.I., *Nikolai Ge*, Moscow, 1970.
- Prior, N., *Museums and Modernity. Art Galleries and the Making of Modern Culture*, Oxford, 2002.
- Pugh, P.D.G., *Staffordshire Portrait Figures of the Victorian Era*, Woodbridge, 1998.
- Rahman, K.S., *Ostrovsky: Reality and Illusion*, Birmingham, 1999.
- Remnek, M., Beaven. (ed.), *Books in Russia and the Soviet Union*, Wiesbaden, 1991.
- Riasanovsky, N., *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia 1825-55*, Berkeley, 1959.
- , 'Notes on the Emergence and Nature of the Russian Intelligentsia', in T. Stavrou (ed.), *Art and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, Bloomington, Ind., 1983, pp. 3-25.
- Rice, D. Talbot., *Russian Icons*, London, 1947.
- Rice, T. Talbot., *A Concise History of Russian Art*, London, 1963.
- , *Russian Icons*, London, 1963.
- Richards, T., *The Commodity Culture of Victorian England. Advertising and Spectacle, 1851-1914*, Stanford, 1990.

- Roginskaia, F.S., *Tovarishchestvo peredvizhnykh khudozhestvennykh vystavok: Istoricheskie ocherki*, Moscow, 1989.
- Rozental', L.B., *Kratkii putevoditel' po Tret'iakovskoi galleree*, Moscow, 1929.
- Ruane, C., 'Caftan to Business Suit: The Semiotics of Russian Merchant Dress', in J.L. West & I.A. Petrov (eds.), *Merchant Moscow. Images of Russia's Vanished Bourgeoisie*, Princeton, 1998, pp. 53-60.
- Saburova, T., 'Fotografiia A. Bergnera v Moskve', *Sovetskoe Foto*, March 1991, pp. 36-39.
- Samoilov, A., 'Skul'pturnye portrety Pushkina', *Iskusstvo*, no. 5, 1949, pp. 45-50.
- Sandler, S., 'Pushkin and Identity', in S. Franklin & E. Widdis (eds.), *National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 197-216.
- , *Commemorating Pushkin. Russia's Myth of a National Poet*, Stanford, 2004.
- Saprykina, N.G., *Kollektsiia portretov sobraniia F.F. Vigel' 1786-1856*, Moscow, 1980.
- Sarabianov, D.V., *Russian Art from Neoclassicism to the Avant-Garde*, New York, 1990.
- , 'Lichnost' i individual'nost' v russkoi portretnoi zhivopisi', *Russkaia zhivopis'. Probuzhdenie pamiati*, Moscow, 1998, pp. 128-143.
- Scheijen, S. (ed.), *Working For Diaghilev*, Schoten, 2004.
- Selinova, T.A. (ed.), *Portretanaia miniatiura v Rossii XVIII-XIX vekov*, Leningrad, 1988.
- Severiukhin, D. Ia., & Leikind, O.L., *Zolotoi vek, khudozhestvennykh ob'edinenii v Rossii i SSSR (1820-1932)*, St. Petersburg, 1992.
- Shaw, J. Thomas, 'Puškin on His African Heritage', in D.M. Bethea (ed.), *Puškin Today*, Bloomington, Ind., 1993, pp. 121-135.

- Shipova, T.N., *Fotografy Moskvy – na pamiat' budushchemu 1839-1930*, Moscow, 2001.
- Simmons, E.J., *Tolstoy*, London, 1973.
- Solov'ev, N., *Russkie portrety, graviury i litografii*, (trade catalogue), St. Petersburg, 1909.
- Stasov, V.V., *Nikolai Nikolaevich Ge, ego zhizn', proizvedeniia i perepiskia*, Moscow, 1904.
- Steiner, G., *Tolstoy or Dostoevsky*, London, 1959.
- Sterligov, A.B., *Portret v russkoi zhivopisi XVII-pervoi poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1986.
- Sternin, G.Iu., *Ilya Repin*, Bournemouth, 1996.
- , 'Vsemirnaia parizhskaia vystavka 1878 g. i khudozhestvennaia zhizn' Rossii', *Khudozhestvennaia zhizn' Rossii vtoroi poloviny XIX veka 70-80e gody*, Moscow, 1997, pp. 126-144.
- Strugatskii, N.Z., *Ukazatel' portretov M.E. Saltykova-Shchedrina i illiustratsii k ego proizvedeniiam*, Leningrad, 1939.
- Tartarinova, I., 'The Pedagogic Power of the Master. The Studio System at the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts in St. Petersburg', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 83, no.3, July 2005, pp. 470-489.
- Taylor, B., *Art for the Nation. Exhibitions and the London Public 1747-2001*, New Brunswick, 1999.
- Temple, R., *Icons: A Search for Meaning*, London, 1982.
- Terras, V., *A History of Russian Literature*, New Haven 1991.
- Thomas, K. Tyner, 'Collecting the Fatherland. Early Nineteenth-Century Proposals for a Russian National Museum', in J. Burbank & D.L. Ransel (eds.), *Imperial History. New Histories for the Empire*, Bloomington, Ind., 1998, pp. 91-107.
- Thurston, G., *The Popular Theatre Movement in Russia, 1862-1919*, Evanston, Illinois, 1998.
- Tolstoi v zhizni. L.N. Tolstoi v fotografiakh S.A. Tolstoi i V.G. Chertkova*,

Tula, 1982.

- Tret'iakov, V.P., *Otkrytye pis'ma Serebriannogo veka*, St. Petersburg, 2000.
- Trevor-Roper, H., 'The Invention of Tradition: The Highland Tradition of Scotland', in E. Hobsbawm & T. Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 15-41.
- Tsiavlovskii, M.A. (comp.), *Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva A.S. Pushkina 1799-1826*, Leningrad, 1991.
- Turchin, V.S., *Portrety russkikh pisatelei v russkoi zhivopisi XIX veka*, Moscow, 1970.
- Vainshtein, O., 'Russian Dandyism: Constructing a Man of Fashion', in B. Evans Clements, R. Friedman & D. Healey (eds.), *Russian Masculinities in History and Culture*, Basingstoke, 2002, pp. 51-75.
- Valkenier, E.K., 'The Peredvizhniki and the Spirit of the 1860s', *Russian Review*, no. 34, 1974, pp. 247-265.
- _____, 'The Intelligentsia and Art' in T.G. Stavrou (ed.), *Art and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Russia*, Bloomington, Ind., 1983, pp. 153-171.
- _____, *Russian Realist Art, the State and Society: the Peredvizhniki and their Tradition*, New York, 1989.
- _____, *Ilya Repin and the World of Russian Art*, New York, 1990.
- _____ (ed.), *The Wanderers: Masters of 19th Century Russian Painting*, Dallas, 1990.
- Varshavskii, L., *L.A. Seriaikov*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1949.
- Vatenina, N.A. (comp.), *Il'ia Repin zhivopis', grafika*, Leningrad, 1985.
- Vereshchagina, A., 'Portret-Kontrabanda', *Neva*, no. 7, 1956, p. 188.
- _____, *Nikolai Nikolaevich Ge*, Leningrad, 1988.
- Vilinbakhov, T.B. et al. (comps.), *Gosudarstvennyi Russkii muzei Leningrad*, Leningrad, 1991.

- Vol'f, L.M. (comp.), *Graf Lev Tolstoi velikii pisatel' zemli russkoi v portretakh, graviurakh, zhivopisi, skul'pture, karrikaturakh i t.d.*, St. Petersburg, 1903.
- West, S., *Constructing Consumer Culture: Advertising in Late Imperial Russia to 1914* (Ph.D. dissertation), Urbana, Illinois, 1995.
- Whife, A.A., 'Sartorial Facts and Fashions of the Early 1890's', in A. Saunders (ed.), *High Victorian Costume 1860-1890. Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference of the Costume Society March 1968*, London, 1969, pp. 16-20.
- Wichard, C., & R., *Victorian Cartes-de-Visite*, Princes Risborough, 1999.
- Wilson, A.N., *Tolstoy*, London, 2001
- Wirtschafter, E.K., *Social Identity in Imperial Russia*, De Kalb, Illinois, 1997.
- Woodall, J. (ed.), *Portraiture: Facing the Subject*, Manchester, 1997.
- Zabochen, M.S. (ed.), *'Ia k vam pishu...' Pushkiniana na otkrytakh XIX-XX vv*, Moscow, 1999.
- Zabolotskikh, B., *Russkaia graviura*, Moscow, 1993.
- Zhuikova, R.G., *Portretnye risunki Pushkina. Katalog atributsii*, St. Petersburg, 1996.
- Zil'bershtein, I.S., *Repin i Turgenev*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1945.
- Ziloti, V., *V dome Tret'iakova*, Moscow, 1998.
- Zimenko, V.M., *Orest Abramovich Kiprenskii 1782-1836*, Moscow, 1988.
- Zograf, N.Iu., *Nikolai Ge*, Moscow, 1974.

**‘A Person Does Not Always Look Like Himself’: The Visual
Representation of Russian Writers 1860-1899
Volume II Illustrations**

Emma Helena Minns

School of Slavonic and East European Studies
University College London

Ph.D. History

List of Illustrations

1. I.N. Nikitin, *Portrait of a Hetman/Self Portrait*, circa 1731, RM.
2. D.G. Levitskii, *Portrait of P.A. Demidov*, 1773, TG.
3. V.L. Borovikovskii, *Portrait of G.R. Derzhavin*, 1795, TG.
4. D.G. Levitskii, *Portrait of N.I. Novikov*, 1796-97 (?), TG.
5. O.A. Kiprenskii, *Portrait of V.A. Zhukovskii*, 1816, TG.
6. *Portrait of M.Iu. Lermontov*. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 8 October 1889.
7. *Portrait of M.Iu. Lermontov*. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 14 July 1891.
8. *S.T. Aksakov*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
9. S.L. Levitskii, Group photograph of contributors to the journal *Sovremennik*, 1856.
10. S.L. Levitskii, *A.I. Herzen*, 1865.
11. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of A.I. Herzen*, 1867, TG.
12. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.F. Pisemskii*, 1869, Ivanov Museum of Art.
13. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.N. Ostrovskii*, 1871, TG.
14. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii*, 1872, TG.
15. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.N. Maikov*, 1872, TG.
16. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of I.S. Turgenev*, 1872, RM.
17. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of M.P. Pogodin*, 1872, TG.
18. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of V.I. Dal'*, 1872, TG.
19. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of I.S. Kamynin*, 1872, TG.
20. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1873, TG.
21. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1873, Iasnaia Poliana Museum-Reserve.

22. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of I.A. Goncharov*, 1874, TG.
23. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of D.G. Grigorovich*, 1876, TG.
24. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov*, 1877, TG.
25. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov in the Period of the Last Songs*, 1877-78, TG.
26. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1879, TG.
27. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of I.S. Turgenev*, 1871, State Art Gallery of Armenia, Erevan.
28. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov*, 1872, RM.
29. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1872, RM.
30. N.N. Ge, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1884, TG.
31. I.E. Repin, *Portrait of A.F. Pisemskii*, 1880, TG.
32. I.N. Kramskoi, *The Poet A.N. Maikov Fishing*, 1883, State Literary Museum, Moscow.
33. N.A. Iaroshenko, *Portrait of M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1886, Unknown location.
34. W. Carrick, *N.A. Nekrasov*, 1878. Reproduced in *Na pamiat' Nikolae Alekseeviche Nekrasove*, St. Petersburg, 1878.
35. N.D. Dmitriev-Orenburgskii, *Portrait of I.S. Turgenev*, 1879. Engraved by I.P. Pozhalostin. Reproduced in *Zapiski okhotnika*, St. Petersburg, 1888.
36. *F.M. Dostoevskii*. From original photograph by K.A. Shapiro, 1879. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 7 February 1881.
37. K.A. Trutovskii, *Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii*, circa 1847. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 13 January 1896.
38. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of F.M. Dostoevskii on his Deathbed*, 1881. Reproduced in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii F.M. Dostoevskago v shesti tomakh*, St. Petersburg, 1886.
39. M.M. Panov, *F.M. Dostoevskii*, 1880.
40. V.G. Perov, *F.M. Dostoevskii*, 1872. Engraved by I.S. Panov. Reproduced in *Vospitanie i obuchenie*, 1881.

41. I.E. Repin, *L.N. Tolstoi in Armchair*, 1887, TG.
42. I.E. Repin, *The Ploughman (L.N. Tolstoi)*, 1887, TG.
43. Caricature based on *The Ploughman*. Reproduced in *Iskra*, 1903.
44. I.E. Repin, *L.N. Tolstoi in the Study at Iasnaia Poliana*, 1891, Institute of Russian Literature (*Pushkinskii dom*).
45. I.E. Repin, *L.N. Tolstoi Resting in the Forest under a Tree*, 1891, TG.
46. V.G. Perov, *The Bird Catchers*, 1870, TG, and *Hunters at Rest*, 1871, TG. Reproduced in *Illiustrirovannyi katalog posmertnoi vystavki proizvedenii V.G. Perova (1833-1882)*, St. Petersburg, 1883.
47. The V.G. Perov Hall of the Tret'iakov Gallery, Moscow, circa 1898.
48. Exhibition at the Association for the Encouragement of Art. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 2 June 1879.
49. The 16th *Peredvizhniki* Exhibition. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 10 May 1886.
50. V.G. Perov, *Portraits of Dostoevskii, Turgenev, Pogodin and Dal'*. Reproduced in *Illiustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki v Moskve, 1882 g.*, St. Petersburg, 1882.
51. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*, 1873. Reproduced in *Illiustrirovannyi katalog khudozhestvennago otdela Vserossiiskoi vystavki v Moskve, 1882 g.*, St. Petersburg, 1882.
52. K.A. Shapiro, *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*, 1870. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 29 August 1881.
53. M.M. Panov, *I.S. Turgenev*, 1867.
54. S.L. Levitskii, *I.S. Turgenev*, 1879. Reproduced in *Sochineniia I.S. Turgenev*, Moscow, 1880.
55. *N.A. Nekrasov*. From original photograph by A.I. Denier, 1868. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Stikhotvoreniia N.A. Nekrasova. Postmertnoe izdanie. Tom I 1845-1860*, St. Petersburg, 1879.
56. *I.S. Turgenev*. From original photograph by M.M. Panov, 1880. Engraved by I.I. Khelmitiskii, 1883. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 3 September 1883.

57. *I.S. Turgenev*. From original photograph by M.M. Panov, 1880. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii I.S. Turgeneva*, St. Petersburg, 1884.
58. *S.T. Aksakov*. *Carte de visite* produced by Vezenberg and Co., St. Petersburg, circa 1870s.
59. *N.A. Nekrasov*. *Carte de visite* produced by Vezenberg and Co., St. Petersburg, circa 1870s.
60. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of S.T. Aksakov*, 1878. TG.
61. *S.T. Aksakov*. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, no. 38, 1891.
62. *A.N. Maikov*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
63. *N.A. Nekrasov*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, 1869.
64. *A.N. Ostrovskii*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
65. *A.F. Pisemskii*. Reproduced in A.E. Miunster, *Portretnaia galereia russkikh deiatelei*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1869.
66. *N.A. Nekrasov*. Engraved by L.A. Seriakov. Reproduced in *Russkie deiateli v portretakh, gravirovannykh akademikom Lavrentiem Seriakovym*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1882.
67. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of L.N. Tolstoi*. Engraved by V.V. Mate. Reproduced in *Russkie deiateli v portretakh*, vol. III, St. Petersburg, 1889.
68. V.G. Perov, *Portrait of A.N. Ostrovskii*. Engraved by V.V. Mate. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 22 March 1880.
69. *L.N. Tolstoi*. Engraved by F.A. Merkin, 1888. Reproduced in *Russkie deiateli v portretakh*, vol. IV, St. Petersburg, 1890.
70. Sherer and Nabgoltz, *L.N. Tolstoi*, 1868.
71. *I.S. Turgenev*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1876.
72. S.L. Levitskii, *N.A. Nekrasov*, circa 1871.

73. *N.A. Nekrasov*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1877.
74. *F.M. Dostoevskii*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1877.
75. *A.N. Ostrovskii*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Russkie sovremennye deiateli*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1876.
76. *L.N. Tolstoi*. Engraved by F.A. Brokhaus. Reproduced in *Nashi deiateli*, vol. VI, St. Petersburg, 1879.
77. Front cover of K.A. Shapiro, *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, St. Petersburg, 1880.
78. K.A. Shapiro, *I.A. Goncharov*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
79. K.A. Shapiro, *F.M. Dostoevskii*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
80. S.L. Levitskii, *N.A. Nekrasov*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
81. K.A. Shapiro, *M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
82. K.A. Shapiro, *I.S. Turgenev*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. I, St. Petersburg, 1880.
83. K.A. Shapiro, *A.N. Ostrovskii*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1880.
84. K.A. Shapiro, *A.F. Pisemskii*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1880.
85. K.A. Shapiro, *L.N. Tolstoi*. Reproduced in *Portretnaia gallereia russkikh literatorov, uchenykh, artistov*, vol. II, St. Petersburg, 1880.
86. I.N. Kramskoi, *Portrait of N.A. Nekrasov*. Lithographed by I.N. Kramskoi. Reproduced in *Svet*, March 1878.
87. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Obshchepoleznyi kalendar' na 1890*, Moscow, 1889.

88. M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin. Reproduced in *Obshchepoleznyi kalendar' na 1890*, Moscow, 1889.
89. Chocolate box lid with portraits of Pushkin, Lermontov and Gogol. Produced by I.L. Dingz, Moscow, circa 1899, ARPM.
90. N.N. Ge, *Pushkin and Pushchin at Mikhailovskoe*, 1875. Reproduced in *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
91. Bar of Soap with impression of portrait of A.S. Pushkin, 1899, ARPM.
92. Promotional placard for the 'Pushkin Pen', 1899, ARPM.
93. O.A. Kiprenskii, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827, TG.
94. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827, ARPM.
95. Newspaper advertisement for S. Libroovich, *Pushkin v portretakh*, 1899, ARPM.
91. 96. G.J. Geitman, *Aleksandr Pushkin*, 1822. Reproduced in *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
97. N.I. Utkin, *A.S. Pushkin*, 1828. (After Kiprenskii).
98. T. Wright, *A.S. Pushkin*, 1837. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 23 May 1899.
99. Chocolate box lid featuring G.J. Geitman's *Aleksandr Pushkin*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
100. J. Vivien de Chateaubriand, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1826. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 12 November 1883.
101. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Torzhestvo otkrytiia pamiatnika A.S. Pushkinu*, Moscow, 1880.
102. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Torzhestvo otkrytiia pamiatnika A.S. Pushkinu*, Moscow, 1880.
103. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Engraved by L.A. Seriakov. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 29 January 1887.
104. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
105. V.A. Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Reproduced in *Al'bom Pushkinskoi*

iubileinoi vystavki v Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk v S. Peterburge. Mai 1899, Moscow, 1899.

106. Chocolate box lid featuring V.A. Tropinin, *A.S. Pushkin*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
107. Individual chocolate wrapper featuring V.A. Tropinin, *A.S. Pushkin*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
108. Calendar published by the lithographic workshop of M.T. Solov'ev, Moscow, featuring V.A. Tropinin, *A.S. Pushkin* and assorted characters from Russian fairy tales, circa 1899, ARPM.
109. Box of perfume 'Bouquet A.S. Pouchkine'. Produced by Ed. Pinaud, 1899, ARPM.
110. Commemorative Pushkin rosettes, 1899, ARPM.
111. *A.S. Pushkin*. Originally published in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 1837. Reproduced in S. Librosvich, *Pushkin v portretakh*, St. Petersburg, 1890.
112. *A.S. Pushkin*. Reproduced in *Poet Pushkin*, St. Petersburg, 1880.
113. 10 portraits of A.S. Pushkin produced in 1837. Reproduced in *Al'bom Pushkinskoi vystavki, ustroennoi Obshchestvom liubitelei rossiiskoi slovestnosti v zalakh Istoricheskogo muzeia v Moskve 29 maia-13 iunia 1899 g.*, Moscow, 1899.
114. G.J. Geitman, *Aleksandr Pushkin*, 1822. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 29 November 1875.
115. L.E. Dmitriev-Kavkazskii, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1880. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 24 January 1887.
116. Illustration to 'Pushkin at Mikhailovskoe'. Reproduced in *Pushkinskii sbornik*, Moscow, 1899.
117. I.K. Aivazovskii and I.E. Repin, *To the Sea*, 1887, ARPM.
118. 'Pushkin Caramels' featuring I.K. Aivazovskii and I.E. Repin, *To the Sea*. Produced by N. Syromiatnikov, 1899, ARPM.
119. A.M. Opekushin, *Monument to A.S. Pushkin*, 1880. Reproduced in *Zhivopisnoe obozrenie*, 24 May 1880.
120. Various designs for the Pushkin Monument. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 24 May 1880.

121. Opening of the Pushkin Monument. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 1 July 1880.
122. The 1880 Moscow Pushkin Exhibition. Reproduced in *Vsemirnaia illiustratsiia*, 21 June 1880.
123. K. Briullov, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*. Reproduced in the *Al'bom Moskovskoi Pushkinskoi vystavki 1880 goda*, Moscow, 1887.
124. The Pushkin Jubilee Exhibition in the Imperial Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, 1899. Reproduced in *Niva* no. 25, 1899.
125. Front cover to Pushkin Jubilee supplement of *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, May 1899, ARPM.
126. Vodka bottle shaped to resemble A.S. Pushkin, circa 1880s, ARPM.
127. Penknife featuring portrait of A.S. Pushkin, 1899, ARPM.
128. Metal clock face featuring portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by V. Bonaker, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
129. Pushkin Handkerchief. Produced by Brokar and Co., Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
130. Newspaper advertisement for the 'Pushkin clock', produced by M.M. Khazanov, Warsaw, 1899, ARPM.
131. Chocolate box lid with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by I.L. Dingz, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
132. Chocolate box lid with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by M. Konradi, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
133. Individual confectionery wrappers produced by a variety of firms, circa 1899, ARPM.
134. Packet of *papirosy* featuring a portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by A.N. Shaposhnikov, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
135. Promotional placard for 'Papirosy A.S. Pushkin'. Produced by the Bros. Aslanidi, Rostov-on-Don, 1899, ARPM.
136. Promotional placard for 'Pushkinskie' *papirosy*. Produced by N.K. Popov, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.

137. Packet of 'Pushkinskie' *papirosy*. Produced by N.K. Popov, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
138. Packet of *papirosy* 'Pushkin'. Produced by the Bros. Shapshal, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
139. Lid of 'Caramels Pushkin'. Produced by Bligken and Robinson, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
140. Label from bottle of 'Jubilee Liqueur'. Produced by N.L. Shustov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
141. Wrapper from 'Soap A.S. Pushkin'. Produced by A.M. Ostroumov, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
142. Chocolate box lid with portrait of A.S. Pushkin and illustration to the *Tale of the Golden Fish*. Produced by A.I. Abrikosov and Sons, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
143. 'Caramels Pushkin', with a portrait of A.S. Pushkin and characters from his works. Produced by S. Vasil'ev, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
144. 'Caramels Pushkin', with a portrait of A.S. Pushkin, the Pushkin monument and various characters from his works. Produced by V. Shuvalov and Sons, St. Petersburg, 1899, ARPM.
145. Portrait of A.S. Pushkin on commemorative porcelain beaker. Produced by M.S. Kuznetsov, 1899, ARPM.
146. Dedication to A.S. Pushkin on commemorative porcelain beaker. Produced by M.S. Kuznetsov, 1899, ARPM.
147. Illustration to *Ruslan and Liudmilla* on commemorative porcelain beaker. Produced by M.S. Kuznetsov, 1899, ARPM.
148. Tin tray with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by V. Bonaker, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
149. Wall calendar mount with portrait of A.S. Pushkin. Produced by I.D. Sytin, Moscow, 1899, ARPM.
150. Packet of 'A.S. Pushkin *papirosy*'. Produced by N.A. Pilipenko, Kiev, 1899, ARPM.
151. Detail of Chocolate box lid with V.A Tropinin, *Portrait of A.S. Pushkin*, 1827. Produced by the Krupskaja factory, St. Petersburg, 2003.